

THE Catholic Mind

ARTICLES AND ADDRESSES

The Liberal Catholic	<i>Catholic World</i>	545
Are Catholics Anti-Semitic?	<i>Ave Maria</i>	552
"S'ter's" New Look	<i>Marist Missions</i>	560
For a New Foreign-Aid Concept	<i>New York Times Magazine</i>	563
Censorship and Freedom	W. T. Costello, S.J.	570

DOCUMENTATION

On Corneal Transplantation	Pius XII	579
Church and State	Saskatchewan Hierarchy	588
The Catholic in Civic Society	Msgr. Dell'Acqua	601

54th YEAR *An America Press Publication*

ctolite,
esigned
it con-
rent in
venty-five cents
OCTOBER, 1956
LIV, No. 1126

World Coverage in America

Look at the list of topics at the right. On every one of them (and on hundreds more), there was an article or a news comment or an editorial in AMERICA for Catholics within the past year. Do you keep informed on that many subjects?

A Catholic should be alert to world problems, not just from the missionary point of view but because it is of the nature of Catholicism to recognize the whole human race as one family. A Catholic rejoices in the spread of truth anywhere. A Catholic reacts sensitively to injustice no matter who is hurt.

You don't have time, if you are like most people, to do research into background material on news stories or to check cross references in many publications to get a balanced picture of world-wide problems. The staff of AMERICA does this for you, week by week, in AMERICA.

You need world coverage in your regular reading to keep informed as a Catholic on world events today. AMERICA, at a special bargain rate, is made available to you as a CATHOLIC MIND reader.

Selected Topics from AMERICA

Adult Education
Alcoholism
American Legion
Arabs and Jews
Argentina
Art
Atomic Energy
Birth Rate
Censorship
China
Communism
Crime
France
Geneva
Germany
Hospitals
Immigration
India
Intellectual Leadership
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Liturgy
Lutherans
Miracles
Music
Nehru
Negroes
Newman Clubs
Parents
Parish Life
Prayer
Protestants
Radio
Religion
Right-to-Work Laws
Rural Life
Russia
Slums
Socialism
Spain
Teachers
Teen-agers
Trade Unions
United Nations
Vatican
Wages
Washington
Youth
Yugoslavia

THE AMERICA PRESS, 70 EAST 45TH ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LIV

OCTOBER, 1956

NO. 1126

The Catholic Liberal*

WILLIAM J. SULLIVAN, S.J.

TO ITS friends and its enemies, the American Catholic Church presents the picture of a vigorous, confident, well-organized group. Management experts praise the Church; anti-Communists look to her as a pillar of strength; welfare agencies admire her hospitals and orphanages. But beneath the surface of the American Church scene, there exists a tension, a potential conflict, which, if it develops, could seriously damage the mission of the Church in this country. This situation is not easily described or discussed because the elements in the conflict are not completely defined and because the issues involved have a good deal of emotional coloring.

In the American Catholic milieu today there is a group known as the Catholic liberals. Who are these Catholic liberals? For what do they stand? To give a strict definition of

a liberal, or a Catholic liberal, is a very difficult task since "liberalism" can mean practically anything. And there would certainly be little profit in drawing a caricature of the Catholic liberal—the poorly dressed little man with long hair, a foreign accent, and a copy of *Growth and Decline* in his pocket. Avoiding both the strict definition and the caricature, we can try to describe the Catholic liberal in terms of the characteristic tenets of the group.

The Catholic liberal is, first of all, sympathetic toward progress and change. He feels that the past is not necessarily better than the present simply because it is the past. He is interested in the improvement of material conditions, in temporal progress. This attitude he shares with the type-liberal, though not so commonly with the type-Catholic.

The Catholic liberal has, second-

*Reprinted from the *Catholic World*, 411 W. 59 St., New York 19, N.Y., June, 1956.

ly, an habitual readiness to accept truth wherever he may find it, whether that be in Freud or Newman. He is convinced that no man will be always and entirely wrong, and that the chances of an intelligent man having something worthwhile to say—even though he be an atheist—are good enough to justify the effort required to understand him.

We can also note that the American Catholic liberal refuses to identify the Church and her teaching with any particular form of government. He is amused rather than impressed by the scholastic argument that since the Papacy is a monarchy, monarchy must be the most perfect form of government. And yet, somewhat paradoxically, the Catholic liberal is very much concerned with the adaptation and adjustment of Catholic thought to the American political scene.

Finally, the liberal is strong in his support of the rights of the individual and in particular of the right of freedom of thought and expression. It should be evident that such traits are not the exclusive possession of the Catholic liberal, but they do serve to clarify our notion of what a Catholic liberal is.

The tenets that have been outlined here may strike one as being entirely laudable but to a large and powerful segment of the American Catholic body, they are more or less unacceptable. Actually, it is liberalism itself that is objectionable to this element of the Catholic group; and because these tenets seem to smack

of liberalism, they draw the fire of the conservatives.

What is this secular liberalism—if we may call it that to distinguish it from Catholic liberalism—which the Catholic conservatives find so objectionable? It is certainly not the "liberalism" of Mr. Hoover and the NAM. That "laissez-faire" philosophy of government was liberalism a century ago in England, but in twentieth century America, it is the soul of conservatism. American secular liberalism of today is the liberalism of Roosevelt and the New Deal, of Norris and Wallace and Stevenson, of Reuther and Humphrey, of the ADA and the Civil Liberties Union. It is characterized by a naturalism, the remnants of a rationalism, and an individualism but an individualism that, strangely, has expressed itself in a governmental concern for the welfare of the individual.

Added to the objections that many conservatively minded Catholics have to the liberalism of the New Deal and the *New Republic* is the opposition generated by a confusion between contemporary American liberalism and the classical, anticlerical liberalism of nineteenth century Europe. This confusion has only heightened Catholic hostility to "liberalism" and consequently to those Catholics who seem to consort with liberals.

The Catholic Conservative

In its own thinking, the Catholic conservative group insists very strongly on the value and the neces-

sity of tradition. They believe that the good Catholic is necessarily a tradition-directed person. The present often is presented as an unfortunate degeneration from the blessed past. It is from this point of view that the common nostalgia for the Middle Ages arises.

Again, to insist forcefully upon the value of progress in technology and material prosperity, as the liberal certainly does, is for the conservative an aberration from the Catholic spirit of the "earthly pilgrimage." Finally, the knowledge that the Church is the divine repository of truth promotes a we-from-our-lofty-abode-attitude toward the gropings and searchings of others after the truth.

Expressions of this conservative Catholic mind can be found in many different fields. The economic writings of Father Edward A. Keller, C.S.C., are a manifestation of it, as are the film criticisms of William Mooring, and some of the political pronouncements of Clarence Manion. The enthusiastic response that has in some sections greeted the proposals of Christopher Dawson for a system of education based primarily on the Catholic past is, I believe, another expression of the conservative Catholic mind.

These descriptions of the liberal and conservative positions in American Catholic society have taken us

somewhat afield; but they were necessary in order to get a clear picture of the situation. There is then in the American Catholic body a large and influential group of conservatives who are in many ways strongly opposed to liberal ideas and attitudes. There is also a group of Catholic liberals who are in some respects similar to and sympathetic toward the secular liberal element in our culture. And this is, I believe, where the danger lies. The Catholic liberals find themselves occupying a middle position between the conservative Catholic and the secular liberal. The tenets, the beliefs, and the dreams of the Catholic liberal do unquestionably resemble those of the contemporary American liberal; but I believe that the Catholic liberal has a valid and distinct middle position, and that, therefore, it would be a mistake and an injustice to identify him with his secular counterpart.

Inherent Dangers

The dangers inherent in such a situation can be seen most clearly in the mirror of history. Among the uses of history is the task of illuminating the present in the light of past experience. The history of the West furnishes several striking examples of situations very similar to that which we have found in contemporary American Catholicism.

One of the major figures of the Greek classical age, and certainly the one who has most captured the imagination of succeeding eras, is Socrates. Socrates—moralist, soldier, philosopher, satirist. Immensely popular though he was at times, Socrates came to a strange and dark end. He was put to death by his fellow citizens on the charge of refusing to honor the gods and of corrupting the youth. How could Socrates, a man who was so vitally interested in developing a solid moral code, be put to death on such a charge?

Socrates lived at a time when the traditional Greek morality, the morality of myth and manners, had collapsed. The disturbances created by the Peloponnesian War and the attacks of the sophists and skeptics were both responsible for the collapse. In place of the old mythology-supported morality of the Golden Age, a new amoral pragmatism grew up. This new morality of expediency and might reached its peak during the rule of the Thirty Tyrants. When in the counter-revolution of 403 B.C. the conservative, democratic government was restored to power, the people were determined to return to the old ways, to re-establish the morality of the fathers.

But how does Socrates fit into this picture? Why is it that shortly after the overthrow of the Tyrants, he is on trial for his life? Socrates was certainly a defender of a stable moral code. The whole purpose of his life was to find a solid, incontrovertible basis upon which the

structure of a good life could be erected.

This is true; but Socrates felt that before men could become truly good, before a firm, rationally grounded morality could be established, a critical and destructive examination of the current morality of custom, the morality of the myths, was necessary. And Socrates set about this critique with great vigor. To us this is admirable; but the men of his own time saw his criticism of the things they held dear against the background of the new morality, of the pragmatism born of the war and the utilitarianism spread by the sophists. From their point of view, Socrates melted into that background and became indistinguishable from it. It is for this reason that the citizens of Athens brought Socrates to trial on the charge of being an enemy of the state.

Socrates went down because the conservatives could not, or at least did not, distinguish him from their known enemies. There is no doubt about Socrates' own attitude toward the new morality. He saw its weakness and its viciousness, and he attacked the sophists and skeptics with as much vigor as he did the moralists of convention. But because he was also attacking the conventional morality, the defenders of the established order classed him with the pragmatists and sophists, and brought about his downfall. "Such was the end," wrote Plato, "of our friend, a man, I think, who was the wisest, the most just, and the best man that I have ever known."

Though it may surprise us to hear it, another man who found himself in a similar situation was St. Thomas Aquinas, patron of all Catholic philosophers and theologians. Thomas's unique place among the great thinkers of the Church is due in large part to his work in developing a Christian Aristotelianism. Throughout his life he worked with Aristotelian principles to erect the finest synthesis that the inspiration of the Christian faith has yet produced. This facet of Thomas's work is well known, but it is not as well known that in building this synthesis he encountered great opposition. In developing his Christian Aristotelianism, Thomas was fighting the tradition.

The traditional thought of the early Middle Ages was a Christian Platonism. Augustine had found in Platonism strong affinities for Christianity; and he had tried to integrate Platonic thought into his own work. This Platonic Christianity is found in Anselm, in Erigena, in Peter Lombard. It was the tradition.

There was another group in the medieval intellectual milieu who were very much interested in Aristotle and his thought. These were the Latin Averroists, men who gained their knowledge of Aristotle from the Muslim culture in Spain. These men claimed that they alone were propounding the true doctrines of Aristotle. They had an uncanny knack for selecting and emphasizing the very points in the thought of Aristotle which were particularly "impious" to the Christian Platonists.

This, then, was the situation in which St. Thomas found himself. He was, in a sense, mounting an attack on the Platonic tradition, for he felt strongly that the similarities between Platonism and Christianity were only apparent. But when Thomas attacked the Platonic tradition, its defenders saw not Thomas, but the secular, "impious," Latin Averroists. They saw Thomas and the Averroists as one, and they treated them as one.

There is no question of what Thomas thought of the Averroists. He knew that the Aristotle that they were teaching was inimical to Catholic doctrine. He undertook long commentaries on Aristotle to show that his was the true and correct interpretation. The one bitter piece of writing in the vast *Omnia Opera* of Thomas is a short work in which he attacks the Averroistic "Double Truth" theory. Thomas saw clearly the difference between his teaching and that of the Latin Averroists, but the Platonists did not.

When the first condemnation of secular Aristotelianism was issued in 1270, several doctrines explicitly taught by Thomas were included. Those who were in authority saw the introduction of Aristotle's thought as a threat to Christianity. Unable or unwilling to make fine distinctions, they leveled their guns not merely at the Averroists, but at the Aristotelians in general. When the full scale condemnation came in 1277, Thomas was dead; but among the 214 theses listed by Archbishop Tempier were many that Thomas had taught, and some which we to-

day regard as characteristic of Thomism.

Thus in fifth century Athens and in thirteenth century Paris we find a similar configuration of events. In both cases there was a complex conflict of forces; in both cases, one party suffered condemnation because those in authority did not distinguish him and his teaching from those whom they regarded as absolute enemies.

The Catholic Liberal

To turn now from the past to the tension which we have pointed out within American Catholicism today, it must be admitted that there is a correspondence between many of the tenets of the Catholic and the secular liberal. This correspondence is, however, accidental and not real. That is to say, though both may hold the same position on freedom of the press, or on the right of an individual to participate in government, or on the obligation of the state to aid the individual, these positions are in each case conclusions from a different set of principles and different fundamental concepts. When the Catholic liberal fights for freedom of the press, he does so because of his conviction of the dignity of man, the nature and purpose of human speech, and the obligation that man is under to seek and communicate the truth. It is hardly fair to call him a naturalist or a secularist simply because men of such opinion also hold for freedom of the press.

The Catholic liberal position must not be outlawed merely because it resembles the position of contemporary liberals. Such a condemnation would err in two ways. In the first place, it fails to prove that the position assumed by the secular liberal is wrong, which is in itself by no means evident. It fails secondly to distinguish or to take into account the principles that are behind the Catholic liberal's position on the same issue. This would seem to be a most odious kind of guilt by association.

We are not assuming here that the Catholic liberal is right in all or any of his opinions. It is not in that respect that he has been compared to Socrates or Thomas. Rather, the point to be made is that the discussion of questions and the interchange of ideas that has been going on between the liberal and the conservative element in Catholic thought must continue. There does seem to be a danger that the conservative will try to outlaw the liberal position entirely.

The conservatives are unquestionably in a superior position with regard to the formation and the expression of authoritative thought. Should they refuse to distinguish between the secular liberal and the Catholic liberal, should they refuse to examine the principles upon which the Catholic liberal bases his opinions and rest satisfied with quoting against him censures of classical European liberalism and, finally, should they try to condemn the whole Catholic liberal program, the

Church in this country would incur a serious loss.

Role of the Liberal

Why? Because the Catholic liberal has a vital role to play in the development of Catholic thought and the expansion of Catholic influence in the United States. Ours is undeniably an open society, and in such a society, a liberal can work most effectively at the task of incarnating Catholicism in the American scene. Because of his readiness to accept truth where he may find it, the Catholic liberal and the truth he possesses will in turn be more readily accepted. Insisting as he does on the rights and the dignity of the individual, he will be able to reach individuals who are blocked off from the Church by a false but very real fear of authoritarianism and thought control. And, what is perhaps most important of all, with that firm set of principles that lie at the core of Catholic liberalism, as they lie at the core of all Catholic thought, and that distinguish the Catholic liberal from his secular counterpart, he will be able to give structure and form to American institutions that are threatened by their very openness.



Managing with Six

Everytime someone says to me, "How do you manage with six children!" in that incredulous, bewildered tone indicating you must have to be a special breed to survive, I recall an interview I read two years ago. The answer a mother of eleven gave in that article was, "You have to want to manage." It couldn't be put more succinctly.—*Sally Leighton in COLUMBIA, July, 1956.*

It is for these reasons that an intransigent refusal on the part of the conservatives to engage in a dialogue with the liberals and the assumption of an attitude of condemnation toward them would be a serious disservice to the cause of Catholicism in America, that in which both the conservative and the liberal are ultimately interested.

Catholic liberalism stands today in a difficult position. It is in opposition to the most powerful sections of Catholic thought, and at the same time in danger of being confused with a secularistic, naturalistic liberalism. Is the pattern which led to the condemnation of Socrates and the censure of Thomas going to repeat itself in our time? The factors are present, and to some extent already in conflict. Perhaps the very awareness that this tension exists and the realization born of experience that its unfolding would be seriously harmful will help to prevent the eventuality. Patterns have a way of repeating themselves; but it is precisely the interjection of intelligence and freedom that prevents the repetition from being automatic, and history from being a mere cycle of epicycles.

Are Catholics Anti-Semitic?*

VICTOR J. DONOVAN, C.P.

THERE was a time when this writer considered all accusations of anti-Semitism among Catholics as being typical Blanshardisms or pure figments of a bigot's imagination. It seemed fantastic and beyond belief that Catholics who worship "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews" as their Lord and their God could show anything but love and kindness toward those people from whom He took His own flesh and blood and to whom He referred in the original meaning of His words, when He said: "As long as you did it for one of these, the least of My brethren, you did it for Me" (Matt. 25, 40).

But I have since changed my mind to some extent. Not that I even wish to insinuate that Catholics as such are anti-Semitic. But there are grounds for serious concern on our part. Our words and actions are being used against us. The enemies of the Church are more alert than we are to the possible distortion of our careless talk, our social exclusiveness, and our religious selfishness. It is now time that the charges against us should be given our most serious re-consideration.

You may wonder what has brought about the change in my way of thinking. A friendly Rabbi recently

let me in on a little secret. He told me that the secret of his success in keeping the people coming to his synagogue was attributable in no small measure to the help given him by Catholics, both from among the clergy as well as from among the laity. I gulped and said that we had often been accused of trying to convert them or to take his people away from the synagogue, but that this was the first time we had ever been thanked for keeping them in it. I asked him to explain himself.

He quickly added that he never meant to imply that our help was intentional. But the fact was that he had several times noticed some of his flock drifting away from him. He would miss them for a time; then he would notice that they had returned and were manifesting an increase in religious devotion. On making discreet inquiries into the various cases, he found invariably that the individual had actually gone a long way on the road toward the Catholic Church. But the shock of meeting anti-Semitism in some form or other drove the person back to his own religion, just as the crack of a twig sends a deer scurrying to cover.

The Rabbi's remarks bothered me, so I determined to conduct a little

*Reprinted from the *Ave Maria*, 2400 North Eddy Road, Notre Dame, Indiana, July 21, 1956.

survey of my own. I began by asking my Jewish friends to tell me of any unpleasant experience they might have had from their Catholic neighbors. I did not have long to wait before the answers began to fall into the same pattern as described by the Rabbi. There never was any shocking instance of a Hitler, a Goebbels, or a Julius Streicher. It was merely the subtle form of coldness or disregard for the feelings of Jews manifested on the part of Catholics. It was like the first puff of smoke issuing through a crack in the walls. The Jew did not stop to investigate. Smoke meant fire. He feared being burned. Away he went; back to the synagogue. All the while the enemies of the Church kept up their hue and cry of: "Fire! Fire! Fire!" to assure the Jews that Catholics are anti-Semitic.

There is no need for us to pay much attention to the calumnies of our enemies. But there is plenty of reason for us to hearken to the views of our friends, such as this Rabbi. Do we ever stop to consider the fact that we personally might have been the cause of driving some Jew away from the Church without knowing it? We must ever be conscious that we are like sign posts to a Jew standing at the crossroads of life. We can either direct him to Christ by being Christ-like ourselves; or else we can be like signs that read: Road Closed. Detour. Here are some examples of what I mean.

The first case was brought to my attention by a Jewish businessman who had the highest regard for re-

ligious Sisters. This gentleman came out of his private office in order to give special attention to a Sister whom he saw entering his store. In the course of their conversation he asked her why she was always chosen to do the buying for her community. She answered by saying: "Mother Superior looks upon me as the only Jew in our convent."

A shiver went to the very roots of that man's soul. Here was a religious person whom he admired and respected for her public profession of love for God. Yet apparently she was just another common *goy* that perpetuated the anti-Semitic caricature of all Jews as being sly, tricky, clever, with all the greed of a Fagin or a Shylock. If that was what religious people in convents thought of Jews then what must the Catholic in the street think? These were the thoughts that kept going through the mind of my Jewish friend. Yet he said nothing to embarrass the Sister for her lack of compassion for his feelings as a Jew. Neither did she show signs of realizing the terrible hurt that she had inflicted. But that man has never forgotten the opinion he formed that day of all Catholics. Can we blame him?

Another example of the same type involves a priest and some strangers that stopped to do him a favor. The incident took place in December during the days between the Jewish Feast of Hannukah and the Christian Feast of Christmas. My Jewish friends had always been shy of priests. They never spoke to one

without first being spoken to. But on this occasion they saw a priest standing in the dark waiting by a bus-stop. They halted their car and offered to drive him into town. The priest was glad to accept their kind offer and this made them feel good.

But their feeling of satisfaction did not last long. It was suddenly shattered by the priest, who, upon being told by the two children in the rear seat that they were not looking forward to Santa Claus since they were celebrating the Jewish Feast of Lights, said: "I have often heard that there were still a few Jewish fanatics around, but I have never met any before now." "Fanatics!" Catholics who celebrate their religious feasts and holy-days are called "devout." But the Jews who live up to their religious obligations are called "fanatics."

The young Jewish family that had to bear the brunt of that insulting remark is still wondering why Catholics don't stop to consider the feelings of others. The priest who inflicted that wound upon their hearts will never know how his words were interpreted as being typical of the Church.

Of course, there are always those who react to such stories by saying that the Jews are "too touchy"; they are "too sensitive"; "Everything is anti-Semitism to a Jew"; so forth and so on. But is it enough to tell those people who have seen more than one-third of their world population murdered for being Jewish "fanatics" that they are too sensitive? A Christ-like demonstration of sympathy for

their feelings would do more to dispel their fears than giving them a free psychoanalytic diagnosis of any trouble they might have.

Examples such as these along with many more that could be told should be enough to convince Catholics that they not only bring sorrow to the Jew but also deprive him of the true image of the Catholic religion that he should have. Our people, thank God, do not need to root out of their lives any positive forms of violent anti-Semitism. What they need most is to be made conscious of the tremendous influence that their words and actions have upon their Jewish neighbors.

It comes almost as a complete surprise to some to be told that Jews have the highest regard for our religion. Any deviation from moral standards is overlooked in almost everyone except a Catholic. Having a Jewish friend is like having a second conscience. He knows the Catholic holydays, Fridays and fast days. He knows that Catholics take their religion seriously to the extent that it means to them an eternity in Heaven or in Hell. He respects us for it, but let a Catholic slip once and the Church slips with him.

Judaism or Catholicism

To most Jews there are only two alternatives: Judaism or Catholicism. Judaism cries an emphatic: "No!" to Christ's claim to Divinity. Catholicism affirms a more emphatic: "Yes!" to the same assertion of Our Lord. There is no in-between state to the religious Jew, just as there is none

to the Catholic. All other religious bodies outside the Catholic Church are regarded by the Jew more as a social assimilation than an irrevocable commitment to God. They recognize the fact that a Jewish-Catholic considers himself as one who has definitely crossed the bridge that leads from "the land of desire" into "the land of fulfillment." There is no turning back for him.

When Jo Mielziner, the greatest stage-designer in America today, became a Catholic in 1936, his Jewish father said to him, "Since you cannot stay with the religion of your ancestors, I'm glad you're going into a *real* one."

Love Is Positive

If Catholics gave more thought to the Jewish mind in this matter, they would realize the full significance of that principle: "*Corruptio optimi pessima*." "The corruption of the best is the worst." Or to paraphrase it in a more homely fashion: "Dirt shows up the clearest where the sun is the strongest." Our lives are the windows through which the Light of the World, Jesus Christ, shines upon the Jew. We must not allow any speck of moral dust to show up in our personal relations with our Jewish neighbors. We must be living examples of God's own love for His People as He originally demonstrated it by sending His Only-Begotten Son to die for them. His words to us are frightening: "Woe to the man through whom scandal comes" (Matt. 18; 8).

This brings us to the final point

in our attitude towards anti-Semitism. Catholics must not be content in being free of the positive forms of anti-Semitism nor can they set themselves stolidly down saying: "We will love the Jews when they start showing some signs of loving us." We have a higher motive compelling us to act in a positive manner by the words of Our Lord: "Love one another as I have loved you." Love is something positive.

To act towards the Jews in a negative or, at best, in a neutral manner is like leaving a boat on the beach at the water-line of low tide. The rising waters will soon dash it upon the rocks or carry it out to sea. We must place ourselves beyond the reach of the least suspicion of anti-Semitism, lest we too be dashed on the rocks of religious bigotry. This means that we must live on a level that only the supernatural grace of God can make possible.

Necessity causes us to mention here that the events taking place in the world today, such as the Arab-Israeli dispute in Palestine and the question of religion in the public schools here at home, are shaping themselves into possible serious tests of our spirit in the not too distant future. Feelings are bound to run high where such questions are discussed. Unless we are imbued with solid Christ-like principles we are apt to be swept along by our emotions fanned to fever pitch by propaganda from one side or the other. It may come about, God forbid, that Christ may once again suffer in the flesh of His own People and suffer

worse too in the spirit of His Mystical Members should they allow themselves to follow the example of Herod rather than of Christ.

There have been several strong voices raised in warning by our Catholic leaders. One of the most insistent here in America had been that of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston. Speaking to a Jewish audience on the occasion of receiving the annual award of the Jewish War Veterans of Massachusetts he told them:

Your God is our God, your religion is the source of our religion, your Bible is our Bible. Your patriarchs and prophets and saints are ours also. Abraham is our father. David is our King, the Son of David is our Lord. If Christianity is a tree, its roots are in Judaism. We stem from Judaism as we stem from our forefathers; the Jews are our spiritual forefathers. We depend upon the Jewish religion just as much as we depend upon Jesus Christ. He is the Completion, the Fulfillment, the Realization, the Incarnation of all that was promised to the Jews from the days of Abraham, and for that matter promised to the human race through the Jews from the days of Adam.

The words of Archbishop Cushing along with the solemn pronouncement of Pope Pius XI, who said: "Through Christ and in Christ we are the spiritual lineage of Abraham . . . Spiritually, we are Semites. Anti-Semitism is inadmissible." These are like the words mentioned by Our Lord in the parable of the Gospel when He said: "The sower sows the word. And those by the wayside are they in whom the word is

sown; as soon as they have heard, Satan at once comes and takes away the word that has been sown in their hearts" (Mk. 4;14). It is not enough to hear the words! They must be hidden in our hearts and fertilized by the power of God's grace lest Satan come and snatch them away from us. This grace comes to us through prayer, study, and good works.

The Incentive

We can best find an incentive to pray by joining the Archconfraternity of Prayer for Israel sponsored by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Sion, 3823 Locust Street, Kansas City 3, Missouri. This convent is the American center of a world-wide apostolate that continually beseeches God in the prayer of the Church: "Look with Thine eyes full of mercy upon the children of that stock so long Thy chosen people; may the blood called down on them of old now descend on them a laver of redemption and of life" (*Act. Ap. Sed. XVII*, p. 542).

The greatest impetus given to Judaeo-Christian studies was inaugurated at Seton Hall University, Newark, New Jersey, within the past three years. Its first publication, called *The Bridge*, has been acclaimed by both Jew and Christian alike. It combines a spirit of prayer with scholarly research and offers the greatest opportunity for a calm re-examination of the points that form the basis of a rapprochement between Jew and Christian.

Prayer and study inevitably lead

the individual into seeking new ways of reaching the Jew. This refers to the good works of souls on fire with the love of the Good Shepherd who wept at the thought of the sufferings of the Jews in Jerusalem. If the Son of God was moved to tears over the sufferings of the Jews, how can we call ourselves His followers, unless we too express our sorrow over anti-Semitism by our good works done in their behalf? No one needs to be told how to do this. It is enough to act like a Christian. Abundant opportunities will present themselves.

However, attention should be called to a group in New York City that best exemplifies the apostolate of good works aided by prayer and study. It is called the Edith Stein Guild. Its members endeavor to perpetuate the work of the German Jewess, Edith Stein, who died as Sister Benedicta of the Cross, Carmelite, in the gas ovens of a Nazi concentration camp in August 1942. (See *Ave Maria* Sept. 17, 1955). She went to her death, offering her life as "an oblation for her people, the Jews." Already within the short period of one year this group has grown from a mere handful to over 1,000 members, 400 of whom are Jewish-Catholics. They hold meetings in small family circles as well as in large lecture halls. Their main purpose is to instill into individuals the spirit of Edith Stein who had such great sorrow at the sight of every form of anti-Semitism that she spent hours in doing penance for the faults of people who knew no better. The Guild Center is at

31-34 99th Street, East Elmhurst 69, New York.

The opportunity that we offer to the Jews of meeting Christ-in-us today is similar to the incident told in the life of Our Lord almost 2,000 years ago. Two sincere Jews came to Jesus asking Him one question: "Art thou he who is to come, or shall we look for another?" The Messiah did not reply by engaging them in an argument. He did not give them a book or a pamphlet to read. He did not even preach them a sermon. He merely drew attention to His person, saying to them: "Go and report to John what you have heard and seen" (Lk. 7, 19, 22). Our Lord knew that His good works and example were enough for the sincere inquirer.

Jesus is still being approached by sincere Jews in the world today. He is still being asked the same question by Jews, questioning Him as He lives in us today. We can only do what Christ did. Our good works and kind words are the incontrovertible answer.

This can be best illustrated by an experience told to me by an elderly Jewish gentleman during his instructions for baptism. He said that he had been brought up in Palestine, and had lived his life as a sincere religious man. A heart attack sent him to bed for almost two months in a Catholic hospital. Upon being discharged from the hospital as being strong enough to return home, he asked for an itemized account of his bill. He scrutinized the list of various items and appeared a

bit puzzled. He finally broke the spell by asking the Sister in charge of the office: "How much do I have to pay for the extras?"

Upon inquiring what he meant by the "extras," the Sister discovered that he was referring to all the little acts of kindness shown to the Jew by the Chaplain, the Sisters, and even the nurses not immediately attached to his case. The Sister laughed and said: "My good man, you should not have to pay us for those 'extras.' We should be the ones to pay you. For you came to us as a Jew; one of Our Lord's own flesh and blood. You gave us the opportunity of practicing what we call 'Christian Charity,' which consists in seeing Christ, the Son of God, in every son of man. For He once told us: 'As long as you did it for one of these, the least of My brethren, you did it for Me.' (Matt. 25; 40). So you see how we have gained more by your presence here than you have gained by your recovery to health." That was all she said.

But that Jew had had his question answered: "Art thou he who is to come, or shall we look for another?" He had found his Messiah! It was Jesus Christ whom he had seen as a light shining forth through the lives of that Chaplain, the Sisters, and the nurses. He responded to God's invitation. He was instructed in the faith. He was baptized and received his first Holy Communion in his home. As Our Lord was brought to him in the Blessed Sacrament that day it

seemed as though I could almost hear Christ saying, as He once said to the old man, Zacchaeus, in the Gospel: "Today, salvation has come to this house, since he, too, is a son of Abraham. For the Son of Man came to seek and to save what was lost" (Lk. 19, 9).

Leon Bloy, the famous French writer, once wrote a book called, *Le Vieux de la Montagne*, in which he depicted the horrors of anti-Semitism. After piling argument upon argument drawn from scripture, reason, and tradition, he reached his climax by saying: "Anti-Semitism... is the most horrible slap in the face suffered in the ever-continuing Passion of Our Lord: it is the most stinging and the most unpardonable because He suffers it on *His mother's face*, and at the hands of Christians."

The Commandment

It is a well known fact that even the most hardened criminal will grow weak and break at the sight of his own mother in tears, especially if she is weeping for something that he has done to her himself. Surely, therefore, that Christian must be inhuman that does not detest anti-Semitism when he sees his Blessed Mother, Mary of Nazareth, as she sits with her face in her hands weeping in the vision of Our Lady of LaSalette. Among her greatest sorrows is, as Bloy says, the sight of what anti-Semitism does both to him who suffers it and to him who inflicts it.

Mary has had to weep at the sight of all those that were murdered in

the "brick-kilns of Egypt" down to the "gas-ovens of Auschwitz"; from the rejection of Bethlehem, "there was no room for them in the inn," down to the discrimination of Anytown, U.S.A.

There is only one way of bringing comfort and consolation to Our Lady. It is by being obedient to her petition: "Do whatever He tells you" (Jn. 2; 5).

What does Our Lord tell us to do? "Love one another as I have loved you." This means in our present day to open our hearts and our

homes to all men, especially to the Jews. For by taking them in we take Him in. What more precious reward could we ever hope to receive in our efforts to stamp out anti-Semitism than by hearing those words of the Divine Son spoken to His Heavenly Father in our behalf when we come to stand before the Judgment Seat of God: "I was a stranger and you took me in" (Matt. 25; 35)?

This is the only motive worthy of a Catholic in any discussion about anti-Semitism.



Forbidden Luxury

Catholics do not have the luxury let alone the right to shirk the duties of political society. It is an obligation of *legal justice* that the citizens be concerned with the way civic matters are run. The burden of our inheritance is freedom, not freedom only on the level of national politics but on the level of city politics as well. We should, hence, be as solicitous with City Hall as we are with the White House, since legal justice is that virtue which inclines the citizen to work for the good of the community.

—Joseph F. Menez in the VOICE OF ST. JUDE, March, 1956.

"S'ter's" New Look*

SISTER MARY ALEXANDER, S.M.S.M.

ALL SORTS of things were running through my mind as I faced my wiggly fourth-graders (I'm a student teacher at Boston College School of Education) and racked my brain for a way to tell them that come the New Year comes the New Look! How to tell them that Sister would no longer be wearing her cupcake headgear but would appear in a new, stream-lined canonically approved 1956 model.

Most children regard nuns as something not quite human—in some vague way synonymous with God—but that their headpiece is a natural part of them, like their eyes and hands. I remember one day when I myself was a second-grader how excitedly I burst into the house at lunch time to tell my mother an astonishing bit of information. During recess the wind had picked up Sister's voluminous skirts to reveal two neatly black-stockinged legs! I don't know what I thought held Sisters up but it had never occurred to me that it could be anything so commonplace as ordinary legs. And it was only recently that one friendly little chap gazed up inside my fluted bonnet to exclaim: "Hey, S'ter, you've got black hair!"

There's an axiom in education, "always get the answer from the children," so instead of just bluntly telling them Sister wasn't going to be Sister anymore, I asked them if any had heard their parents discussing what the Holy Father had said about religious Habits and the changes he recommended. Four hands went up. Michael answered, "Yes, S'ter, he said that you should get rid of a lot of that stuff!"

Well, get rid we did! The biggest change is in the headpiece. Gone are the frills! I remember when I was a postulant how intrigued I was with our fluted coronet, but intrigue was no word for it when it came time to learn how to iron it. No nun will ever admit that her "crowning glory" isn't most attractive, sensible and what have you, and even if I did feel like singing "don't fence me in," I would have defended it with all the eloquence and feminine illogic that a woman can use to defend her purchase of a Lily Dache creation.

*Reprinted from *Marist Missions*, 863 Central St., Framingham Centre, Mass., December, 1955.

Many people, especially in America, have misinterpreted the purpose behind the changes advocated by the Pope, construing it to be a mere matter of making the Habits more attractive. But it is a moot question as to what is attractive! And there was ample proof of this in the community's impromptu style-shows staged before the Regional Chapter met in Rome.

It was democracy in action. Anyone who had an idea was free to submit it, and even gowns by Dior were never subjected to the close scrutiny that these creations underwent. The opinion polls were one of the most interesting aspects of the whole procedure, for did you ever see a group of women try to agree on something, especially when that something is as important as what she will wear on her head.

But eventually the Mothers met and the matter was decided. Retaining the blue-bordered shoulder cape for Mass and formal wear only, the remainder of the Habit was completely revised, featuring ankle-length dress of orlon with incorporated scapular, a shortened plastic rosary, detachable collar, even service weight nylons! But the big change was the simplified headdress with a black circular veil and peaked white brim replacing the large fluted cap distinguishing the Congregation for almost a century. For summer wear a light weight Habit was devised, while for the tropical missions the Habit is white, with nylon veiling.

If the final result proves attractive, God bless those who worked so hard to make it so, but at least no one will be able to say that the changes are not modest, modern, and eminently practical—the real purpose of the directives from the Vatican! Anticlerical criticism and pressure against religious is rampant in Europe, and one of the most heavily loaded charges is that although nuns vow poverty they sometimes use enough material to clothe three people! In the United States such criticism doesn't carry too much weight, but in poverty-ridden Europe it's a charge not to be dismissed lightly.

But to get all this down to the level of my fourth-graders! After explaining to them that all my frills would be gone, I stressed the main advantage of soon being able to take all 58 of them in a single sweeping glance. I turned my head to one side of the room and demonstrated the fact that the other half was cut off from my vision. "Sorta like horse blinders, huh, S'ter?" remarked one.

As I concluded my little speech and anxious that the youngsters wouldn't be spreading it all over the parish that their regular St. Joseph teacher was changing *her* Habit, my supervising teacher, well

versed in the garbled accounts of children, queried, "Now, children, which Sister is going to change her Habit?"

"S'ter Mary Alexander!"

"Am I going to change mine?"

"No, S'ter!"

"Why not?"

"Because you can see fine now, S'ter!"

So it's New Year and a New Look for the Marists. And as far as my wiggly fourth-graders are concerned, I hope my experience will be similar to that of one of our Sisters in San Francisco in charge of the altar boys. When she appeared in the New Look, the youngsters stared at first, but one summed it all up, in a long, slow whistle—"Gee, S'ter, you look good!"



Church-State Separation

The constitutional separation of Church and State is uncompromisingly absolute precisely in regard to laws "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In regard to these two intrusions upon religious freedom let the Jeffersonian wall be high and impregnable. But between these two walls there has been, from the earliest days of our national history, a spacious corridor of cordial intercourse, a mutually friendly cooperation, manifest in countless ways between government and religion, that was born of the conviction that this nation was conceived under God and for its survival and the preservation of its liberties must endure under God.—*Joseph F. Costanzo, S.J., in THOUGHT, Summer, 1956.*

For a New Foreign-Aid Concept*

BARBARA WARD

THE TIME has clearly come to do some hard, new thinking on the whole issue of foreign aid. A full decade has passed since it began to be an annual feature of budget making in the United States—and in the British Commonwealth and indeed among the European colonial powers as well. Moreover, the suggestion has now been made by the Republican Administration that aid, in some form, should continue for at least another decade. The Colombo Plan—under which British Commonwealth countries contribute to Asian development—has had its life extended and there are successive five-year development schemes in many colonies.

One way and another, it is a safe generalization to say that over the last decade and probably for another decade to come, the Western powers are contributing about 1 per cent of their rising national incomes to help forward the development of less fortunate lands. In some years—for instance, at the height of the Marshall Plan—the American percentage has been even higher.

This vast transfer of wealth which, if sustained, could exceed \$100 billion (from all Western sources) by 1966, has been undertaken, on the

whole, under the spur of necessity. The Western Governments rightly believe that economic collapse is the inevitable prelude to Communist expansion. Sooner than see segment after segment of the free world slip under totalitarian control, they have put their hands in their pockets and paid up.

Program No Failure

It cannot be said that the program has been a failure. Given the scale of economic and political disintegration caused by the last war, the advance of communism might have been much more devastating. To give a concrete example, if India had failed to secure the American wheat loan during the 1951 famine, distress in the cities and resentment against internal grain hoarders would almost certainly have returned Communist Governments to power in some of the southern Indian states. These areas would then have become the beachheads—the Yenans—for further Communist advance.

Even the Chinese débâcle does not disprove the point, for the aid given was relatively small and the catastrophe had been prepared by forty years of internal upheaval and

*Reprinted from the *New York Times Magazine*, March 11, 1956.

civil war and nearly a decade of enemy occupation.

Yet there are plenty of voices raised to protest that the policy has not been a success, either. There is a widespread feeling that it is not giving value for money and the feeling has been intensified by Mr. Khrushchev's junketings around Asia.

Take the example of India again. Since 1949, American gifts or grants to India have amounted to about half a billion dollars. The free gifts of steel alone—with the inclusion of the recent deal for India's railroads—have reached about 750,000 tons. Yet when the Russians announce that they will sell—not give, but *sell*—a million tons of steel to India, the Indian press breaks out in hosannas while all America gets is a spanking for Mr. Dulles' indiscretions over Goa. If foreign aid is a program for making friends and influencing people, it seems, in India, to be a flop.

The outlook is in some ways even less satisfactory in Burma and Indonesia. Both countries have actually refused American aid on the grounds that it would weaken their neutrality. Yet Burma's Premier U Nu is all gratitude when Russia offers to sell machinery and technical aid in return for rice—once again, the element of giving is marginal—and Indonesia is ready to receive Soviet and satellite aid in expanding its oil and rubber industries without, apparently, a qualm over neutralism.

The Russians seem to be able to get more support by selling than the West by giving. Surely there is

something wrong with a program that produces such an equivocal result.

New Cause for Doubt

These attacks on the effectiveness of foreign aid are all the more bitter because they are relatively new. Up to last year, it was difficult to attack Western foreign aid for producing fewer results than Soviet offers, since there were no Soviet offers—save to Communist China. The entry of Mr. Khrushchev into the field—with offers of dams and steel plants and machinery and technicians (all at a price)—has created an entirely new entry point for criticism and doubt.

Nor is it simply that political results can be compared—with disparagement for Western achievement. The whole concept of competitive aid-giving becomes increasingly distasteful. Where will it end? Are the Western powers now to dance to any tune a local Asian—or indeed African—Government chooses to play, simply because Moscow is waiting in the wings and shuffling its feet?

Senator Russell was no doubt hardly serious when he suggested that annual foreign aid programs—which no one suggests should exceed \$4 billion—would “bankrupt” an America with a national income nearing \$400 billion. But his uneasiness sprang from the not unreasonable fear that Mr. Khrushchev's promises and not Asia's needs could come to determine future economic assistance.

The whole effort could get out of hand and the West would find itself maneuvered into a competitive game of aid in which ever higher grants brought it ever smaller political returns. These are not irresponsible reservations. They only underline once again the need to give the whole concept of foreign aid a long, hard look.

Reassurance

The first point to be noted is reassuring. Russia's entry into the field of foreign aid has not undone the solid work of reconstruction already achieved in Asia with help from the West. The internal Communist party in such key areas as Burma and Malaya is very much weaker than it was, say, in 1948, and a principal reason for this is the fact that there has been no disastrous collapse of local economies such as preceded the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek in China. In fact, in so far as Soviet aid helps to strengthen economic life in Asia, it can even be a factor in strengthening the present non-Communist regimes.

The initiative that the Russians appear to have gained is much more in the international arena, in the sensitive, fluctuating relations between the free world, the Communists and the uncommitted nations. This initiative is political. Indeed, it is impossible either to gauge or counter Russia's new economic policies unless one remembers that, under the Communist system, everything is subordinate to ideology, in

other words, to political manipulation.

But this fact does not weaken Russia's effectiveness. On the contrary, the political slant of Communist economic policies—whether of loans or technical assistance or barter or ordinary trade—is their great strength. *Equally, the lack of any political or ideological framework is the greatest single source of weakness in the aid program undertaken by the West.*

Soviet Strategy

The Soviet Union seeks to export two main ideological themes. The first is negative—the imperialist record of the West. Russia's control over its satellites in Europe seems remote from Asia. And its earlier colonizing march eastward across the steppes did not result in imperial control over civilized and self-conscious communities such as India or Burma or the Malayan principalities. The Soviet brand of colonization has therefore barely impinged upon Asian consciousness whereas the memories of British or French or Dutch colonial control are still recent and raw.

One may ask, it is true, how Soviet propaganda has continued to include the United States—the least imperialist great power in recorded history—in the imperialist smear. But the answer is clear. It relies partly upon “guilt by association” brought about by America's link with its Western colony-holding allies.

It also uses the lunatic syllogisms of Marxism—"all capitalists are imperialists, America is capitalist, therefore it is imperialist." But it can also exploit a fact of colonial history not always understood in the West but painfully remembered in Asia.

A chief technique whereby Western powers obtained control in Eastern lands was by siding with one or the other side in a local civil war and then dominating the victor to whom they had assured success. The Western powers, for instance, secured many of their semi-colonial privileges in China by helping the Manchu Emperor to defeat the great Tai Ping revolt of the mid-nineteenth century. Against this quite recent historical background, it has been easy for Communist propaganda to interpret American support for Chiang Kai-shek in the Chinese civil war as the re-entry point of "Western imperial control" in China.

Nor have by-products of the conflict, such as military operations by Chinese Nationalists in Northern Burma and their intrigues with local Karen dissidents, lessened suspicion. In fact, these activities were the main reason for Burma's refusal to accept further American aid while welcoming Russian offers. Asia is still mined with anti-Western suspicion. This is a fact of history and only a different evolution of future history will modify it.

But fully as important to Soviet propaganda are its *positive* pictures of Communist world policy and of the place of proffered economic aid

within this wider ideological framework. The Soviet Union, so the propaganda trumpet proclaims day after day, stands for a world in which all domination by one nation over another will cease, in which all will cooperate in creating a peaceful brotherly international order and in which socialist production—already so brilliantly successful in Russia—will raise living standards to undreamed-of heights.

"And in proof, good friends in Asia, of the success of Communist methods at home and of the wealth which we can create ourselves and want to help you to create, here is a steel mill—at only 2½ per cent interest rates—and here a million tons of steel—though paid for in Indian goods."

Aid, in short, is simply part of a much wider sales talk on communism as a method and a goal, a method of raising internal wealth and for sharing it in a cooperative world order. Soviet propaganda does not make its offers negatively—as a means of *defending* either itself or Asia against the West. The underlying theme is the collapse and decadence of capitalist imperialism. Not out of fear but out of success, generosity and confidence the new economic offers are made.

All this may make Mr. Khrushchev sound unbearably brash in Western ears. But to the new nations of Asia, it may seem more like the voice of achievement and self-respect.

In comparison with all this, our Western political approach makes a

very poor showing. It is in fact overwhelmingly negative and defensive. In numberless debates in Congress, in speeches without end to Western electorates, in commentaries and articles, one theme emerges above all—that giving aid to backward areas is a painful necessity made inevitable only because they must be kept out of the Communist camp.

Nearly every program of assistance is finally rammed through the Legislature with the techniques of Dicken's Fat Boy—"I wants to make yer flesh creep." Refuse this appropriation and Bongaland will slip forever under the Communist yoke.

But then, by a remarkable psychological somersault, the same legislators who have grimly consented in pure self-interest to provide perhaps half the necessary funds, denounce the recipient peoples as ungrateful scoundrels who show no due appreciation of the magnificent generosity shown them (in strict preservation of Western skins). Yet is it logical to expect gratitude for steps taken openly and crudely in self-defense?

This sense that Western economic assistance is, in Western eyes, no more than a weapon in the cold war has, of course, been intensified by its close association with military aid. Not only do nations which sign on militarily receive more aid, but the balance of military and economic assistance in the general Western aid budget is heavily weighted on the military side. Yet if there is one hope more determined than any other among the peoples of Asia it

is to keep out of atomic war. The Russians rarely mention war—except to rattle their own hydrogen bombs. If Soviet tanks are sent to Egypt, Colonel Nasser promises nothing. He is not pressed to take sides. No Russian envoy inveighs against Indian or Burmese neutralism. On the contrary, they are praised for being "peace-loving." Even where close Russian defense ties exist—as with China or North Korea—the economic aspects of aid are underlined, the military glossed over. Russian aid does not, therefore, appear to tie the recipient to either side in the world struggle. It appears to respect neutralism.

Many Western statesmen, on the contrary, are forever nagging at Asia on this issue. As a result, they seem for their own selfish reasons to be drawing the East toward an atomic armageddon. There can be no doubt which attitude has the greater political appeal.

In all this welter of Western insistence upon self-interest and self-defense, one looks in vain for any consistent exposition of a *positive* policy of foreign aid, some general political philosophy to match the Communist confidence in world brotherhood based on Socialist production, some framework of solidarity between givers and takers of aid, some aspect of human concern beyond the narrow limits of common fear. Once or twice, a more generous Western initiative has been taken.

President Truman's original Point Four concept of aid called for a

"bold new program" of shared technical progress. President Eisenhower, in one major speech, spoke of pledging the free world's resources to combating want and disease and hunger—the permanent enemies of mankind. But by no effort of imagination can these few initiatives be stretched out into a consistent, sustained expression of Western intent. The positive utterances are quite drowned in the flood of argument and debate based exclusively upon fear and defense and cold war and the Communist menace.

If the West has a positive policy, Asia has not heard of it. But it hears about Communist brotherhood and Socialist solidarity every day of the week. Is it surprising that the political impact of Soviet economic offers is heightened thereby, while the West goes on giving more but with less effect?

The Urgent Question

The urgent question now is whether the Western powers can do anything to lessen or end the ambiguities and disappointments so far attendant upon the giving of foreign aid. There are, in fact, only three alternatives—to stop giving it altogether, to put up with the political disadvantages and to continue the present program on a "cold war" basis, or to try to find the proper political framework for a consistent program.

The first may be ruled out, for, whatever the political disappointments of the last decade, the fact remains that Western aid can still

make a crucial difference economically between stability or collapse in Asia, for collapse helps one side only—the Communists.

The second alternative is possible but very unattractive. It could lead in the end to total frustration for, if Western giving continues without corresponding political advantage, domestic pressures against the program will grow, the aid will be given ever more grudgingly, the effects will become even less advantageous—and so on in a downward spiral of resentment and ill will.

There remains the third alternative—to find a positive political philosophy of Western assistance so that the program of foreign aid may be based not solely on expediency, self-interest, Communist competitiveness or the cold war, but upon conviction and principle. Such a program should not be beyond the West's political imagination. On the contrary, it can be argued that it is a logical development of our existing social traditions in the West.

Our One Hope

Long before the Communists appropriated it, the solidarity of mankind was a firm base of Western, Christian tradition. Today, under the shadow of the hydrogen bomb and atomic fall-out, we have at least a physical solidarity of potential destruction. And if we are "one world" in physical vulnerability, our only hope is to become one world in moral responsibility as well.

Within the national community, we have discovered, in the last cen-

tury, one key to a shared sense of moral solidarity in the principle of "the general welfare"—in other words, in an agreed sharing of wealth between well-to-do and underprivileged. This technique only waits to be extended, as a matter of conviction and principle, to the world of nation-states which now make up one neighborhood in our shrinking, atomic world.

The formula devised and proved workable after the war in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is probably the best mechanism to express the new solidarity. One per cent of national income contributed to backward areas from the wealthy West—the percentage which they have, without planning or policy, in fact expended in the last decade—would meet world needs today and would expand further as national incomes continue to bound up around the Atlantic.

But the mechanism is less important than the conviction, accepted by electorates and by their representatives, that in the twentieth century, in a world made one by science and technology, communities claiming Christian inspiration and inheriting the humanism of Western tradition must extend their sense of solidarity beyond national frontiers. In the words of the poet, Auden, "we must love each other or die."

And, as so often happens when principle takes the place of expediency and good-will of fear, we should find that such a change of emphasis would go far to counter

what is practically unsatisfactory and discouraging in our present programs. A settled policy of aid, based upon a predetermined percentage of national resources, would make possible the long-term planning of aid which President Eisenhower has declared to be necessary for the program's full effect.

The decision to extend aid as a matter of conviction and principle removes the effort from competitive bidding in the cold war and the scale of aid would be determined not by Russian offers and cajolements but by settled Western practice. The accent on the cold war could fade because it would no longer be essential to secure appropriations under the forced draught of fear. Above all, the link with war and atomic weapons and military preparedness could be broken because the program would exist independently of any threats of aggression and would continue equal and unshaken in times of crisis as in "a calm world and a long peace."

Such a change of emphasis might not overnight dispel the memories of centuries of Western imperialism or reassure Asia entirely on the purposes and policies of the powerful West. But in a decade or more, when time had reinforced the principle, and foreign aid had become an orderly procedure, unhurried, unquestioned and unafraid, it would be found that Asian suspicions and Western frustrations had alike given ground before the new world-wide experiment in partnership and good-will.

Censorship and Freedom*

WILLIAM T. COSTELLO, S.J.

THE urge of man to be absolutely free of law is nowhere more deeply felt than in the area of speech, written or spoken. Restraint is particularly felt in the area of the written word. A man may feel a certain freedom to *speak* secretly what he thinks, at least to his confessor or his dearest friend. But when it comes to committing what he secretly thinks or desires to the awful inevitability of a piece of paper, a man feels restraint. Since "*quod scripsi, scripsi*—what I have written, I have written," every man censors himself on what he shall write, even in the camera of his diary.

Since man's written word is immediately censorable, we point out at once that literature, the written record of the intelligent anthropoid, is immediately subject to scrutiny: scrutiny by the author himself and others—because of others. And because the written word, more than any of the other arts, is aimed at being immediately intelligible, it follows that literature will be the most self-conscious of the arts. If we prescind from such odd censorship as the Mohammedans' of pictorial art or the Soviets' of "bourgeois" music, it is safe to say that only literature,

which the commonalty may be presumed to understand for itself, has consistently felt the censor's boot heel.

Censorship As Old As Man

It is possible for us who live in the twentieth century to think that the censorship of the written word is a marasmus of our own time. That a newspaper correspondent in Prague cannot file his story as he has written it, or that more and more areas of governmental information are becoming "classified," or that the several states are drafting censorship laws, or that university administrations are becoming acutely aware of professorial indiscretions, may seem symptoms of the progressive atrophy of freedom. But censorship is not something new in the history of man. All men, particularly we of the West, have censored, censor, and, if we will keep our tradition, will always censor. As Gilbert Highet puts it: "From the practice of every human society . . . limitations on knowledge are devised in order to protect society against the antisocial and the irresponsible."

Censorship is as old as the human race. In a very real sense, God cen-

*The initial lecture of the annual Gonzaga University Lecture Series, Gonzaga University, Spokane 2, Washington, November 4, 1955.

sored the tree of the knowledge of good and evil for Adam. Restive under this censorship, Adam became "fugitive" from his "cloistered virtue" with certain unhappy results. In our Western world there is a long tradition of the restraint which a man puts upon his utterance. Anaxagoras, for example, was sent from the city of Athens because of blasphemy, while the Areopagus ordered the books of Protagoras burned because of his confession of agnosticism. Rome enjoined upon the censor the obligation of prosecuting anyone who endangered the moral or material well-being of the Republic or acted in any way unbecoming a Roman citizen. This imperial exercise of censorship continued under the Christian emperors.

The history of ecclesiastical censorship properly begins in the year 150 when the Council of Ephesus condemned and prohibited the *Acta Pauli*, a romanticized life of St. Paul. The most striking exercise of early ecclesiastical censorship, much of it surely taking place behind the back-drop of history, was the final establishment of the Biblical canon. It is impossible to imagine the sifting and weighing which took place before the Books of Machabees were universally accepted and such pseudo-gospels as those of St. Thomas and St. Peter definitively rejected. In other words, as soon as the Church had gained her liberty, she was saddled with it.

It is not easy to trace the history of censorship through the Middle

Ages. Mortimer Adler puts it well when he says:

The secular arts played such a relatively unimportant part in human life and society that there was little occasion for their supervision to become a practical problem for either the state or the church . . . Insofar as there was any censorship during the Middle Ages, it was directed not at poetry or imaginative literature, but primarily at intellectual literature.

The "intellectual literature" to which censorship was primarily directed was, of course, theology and philosophy. Some of this censorship, like the censoring of Thomism by the masters of Oxford University (1277) under the influence of Kilwardby, Archbishop of Canterbury, was the result of petty bickering and small-minded revenge; other exercises of censorship were landmarks in the development of dogma and the history of ideas.

There is no need to catalog other celebrated cases of medieval censorship, such as that of Abelard, whom Maurice De Wulf calls "the knight-errant of dialectics," of David of Dinant, the pantheistical gadfly, to whom St. Thomas in a rare burst of temper refers as that fellow "who most stupidly postulated that God is prime matter," of Abbot Joachim in 1215, of Meister Eckhart, Marsilius of Padua, John of Jandun, and William of Occam in the 1320's.

We must note, however, the censorial supervision generally imposed on university affairs at this time. According to the Legantine Statutes of 1366 for the University of Paris,

not only were the exact books prescribed for each stage of the student's career, but the very speed of the professors' lectures was laid down, i.e. not *tractim* (dawdlingly) but *raptim* (quickly). At this time, too, it became the general law that university professors were not allowed to hand over any lecture to the booksellers before it had been examined by the chancellor of the university and the professors of theology. One is intrigued by the concept of modern professors at, say, Harvard sending their lectures across for a quick clearance by the Divinity School!

Before the sixteenth century was very old, it became evident that the heretofore haphazard listing of forbidden works must be reduced to a system. The first of the new formal regulations was issued in July, 1542, by Paul III; this amounted to a reorganization of the Roman Inquisition. We need not delay on all the papal documents involved nor with the various regulatory changes introduced during the course of the century. We notice, however, the Bull of Julius III, 1550, which cancelled all permissions and dispensations to whomever granted for the reading of prohibited books. This, and especially the Index of Paul IV, evoked cries of anguish from every quarter of Europe.

The theological pyrotechnics of Paul IV are a historical commonplace. In his utter zeal for orthodoxy, the pope burned books right and left—and center! Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575), the Zurich re-

former who mildly opposed Luther, wrote to his friend Ambrose Blaurer: "In Rome, Paul IV is burning books, and among others, all the writings of Erasmus. Even the works of Cyprian, Jerome and Augustine are included because they have been rendered pernicious through the notes of Erasmus." This *zelus domus tue* was somewhat mitigated with the death of Paul IV in August of 1559, and the situation began to be normalized when Pius V, in 1571, set up the Congregation of the Index, which took over some of the jurisdiction of the Congregation of the Inquisition. Many subsequent chapters were to be written by the Congregation of the Index, such as the famous *silentium obsequiosum* case involving Arnauld and the Jansenists.

Protestant Censorship

But we are not here writing a history of the Index. We are concerned simply with the general aspects of the problem of censorship, whether it affects Catholics, Protestants, Jews or the followers of Mithra. We remark, however, that if Roman Catholic censorship of Reformation Protestant writings seems excessive, it was only part of the picture and of a piece with what was going on in Protestant areas. For every name on the Roman Index like Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Zasius, Perckheimer, Cas-sander, Blaurerus, Oecolampadius, Zwingli, Islebius, Hutten, Ridley, there was an equally *nominatim* Protestant proscription of Catholic

doctors from Scotus to Suarez, whose book *Defensio Catholicae Fidei* (1613) had the honor of being burned in London by royal command.

In 1538, Henry VIII had proclaimed that no books were to be imported or domestically printed without the examination and approval of the Crown, nor could any English version of the Scriptures be printed without special permission of the King or Privy Council—all under pain of imprisonment and confiscation of property. In 1543, Henry ordered that the "Englised" Scriptures might be permitted only for the higher classes. Roger Ascham, writing in *The Schoolmaster*, probably in the winter of 1563-64, was furious at the laxness of officialdom which suffered

... fond books, of late translated out of Italian into English, sold in every shop in London; dedicated overboldly to virtuous and honorable personages, the easier to beguile simple and innocent wits. It is a pity that those which have authority and charge to allow and disallow books to be printed be no more circumspect herein than they are . . . More papists be made by your merry books of Italy than by your earnest books of Louvain.

In the same year that Ascham was writing (1564), Elizabeth directed the Bishop of London to see to it that thorough inspection be made of the cargoes of incoming ships and that "slanderous and seditious" books be confiscated and destroyed forthwith. Equally significant was the authority granted by Archbishop

Whitgift, in 1586, to a bookseller named Asanius of Renialme to import certain Catholic works, with the restriction that these be reserved for the use solely of the Archbishop and the Privy Council. The reader will remember that the burden of Milton's *Areopagitica* (1644) was the poet's dissatisfaction that his co-religionists had not sufficiently reformed the penchant of "our inquisiturient" Anglican bishops for imitating Roman Catholic imprimaturs.

Modern Times

Since Milton's time, the idea of censorship in Britain has undergone some modification, though it was not until 1695 that the Licensing Act of 1662 expired and, as Macaulay said, "English literature was emancipated . . ." As for theater censorship, a benchmark in Britain is 1737, from which year dates the office of Licensor of Plays and the present system of stage regulation. The act of 1737 resulted from Henry Fielding's attacks on Walpole at the Little Theater in the Haymarket. In 1843, the Theaters Act provided a definition of the Lord Chamberlain's powers. He was forbidden to withhold his license unless "he shall be of the opinion that it is fitting for the preservation of good manners, decorum or the public peace so to do." Presently, the Lord Chamberlain has little to do beyond writing the ground rules for nudity in Leicester Square.

Outside of war time, American censorship has largely had to do

with obscenity, and this, except for the Post Office Department, only at the local police and prosecutor level. State laws are generally couched in generic terms, as e.g., the New York statute of 1927 which lists treatment of sex perversion under the heading of obscenity. The Watch and Ward Society in Boston has long since buried its little hatchet to become a quietly efficient and very valuable private information arm of the local prosecutor. Boston is still the target of jibes, though book censorship in Boston has merited little notoriety since the *Forever Amber* trial of 1948.

Federal agencies, as we said, have relatively rarely been involved in censorship (except in the releasing of "classified" materials) and then only in carrying out the details of an otherwise ordinarily admitted power. James Joyce's *Ulysses* was a cause célèbre in the 1920's, while Postmaster General Walker's banning of *Esquire*, January, 1944, was the result of his interpretation of the Postal Laws and Regulations.

Recent enactments of several state legislatures, e.g., that of the State of Washington, in the matter of comic books should not go unnoticed. According to Senate Bill No. 420, State of Washington, Thirty-fourth Regular Session (1955), Sec. 7, as amended:

No dealer shall print, publish, design, prepare, import, distribute, exhibit, display, sell or possess with intent to sell, or offer to sell any comic book appealing to or likely to be read or looked at by minors under the age of eighteen

years which is obscene or indecent; or which is devoted to the publication or exploitation of fictional or actual deeds of violent bloodshed, lust, crime or immorality by characters depicted either as real or fanciful, human or inhuman, so massed as reasonably to tend to incite minors to violence or depraved or immoral acts against the person.

Whatever defects the law may or may not have—it has not gone unchallenged in the Washington courts—the legislators obviously felt the obligation and the right to restrict freedom of the press in the interest of the common good.

In general, however, it remains true that censorship in the United States is left rather to the conscience-stirrings of private agencies. The strictures of the Legion of Decency, the recently self-imposed code of the Comic Book publishers, the magazine code of the National Organization of Decent Literature are examples of private censorship.

In another area, the exiling of Pogo from Providence, R.I., may be classed as an exercise of censorship; indeed, every newspaper editor in the country is similarly and every day called upon to play censor. The campaigns of temperance groups to secure legislation against beer advertisements on television instance the tendency—indeed, what is felt to be the right—of the individual to censor, or attempt to censor, his fellowman. That the temperance groups are not happy at having their censorial tendencies restrained by a majority at the polls, and that the viewers of Wednesday evening box-

ing matches fail to look with complacency on the efforts of the temperance groups to restrain their liberty, simply points up that "Something there is that doesn't love a wall."

Some Conclusions

From the foregoing, though very inadequate, history of censorship, three conclusions seem warranted: first, censorship seems always to be concerned with three areas: religion, politics and sex; second, censorship is a universal human institution and its proper exercise does not seem inconsistent with human freedom, and, third, certain conditions must be fulfilled in order to avoid the excesses which history shows take place when the censor is not properly efficient.

It is also clear that the three spheres of religion, politics and sex are hopelessly intertangled, so that religion is censored on behalf of good politics, politics in the interest of religion, and sex by both. Why these three are the areas which have been historically most censorable is not quite so clear, though a superficial explanation is possible. Each of the areas corresponds to one of the three basic human societies: the church, the state, the family. How a man believes, how he ballots and how he begets, in other words, how he treats with God, his fellow citizen or his mate, in still other words, what goes on in the confessional, the voting booth and the bedroom seem somehow not to be entirely in the public domain.

The unbridled expression of opinion in these areas is unacceptable to the human race itself, so that blasphemy, sedition and obscenity are censorable almost by common consent. The wall in this or that instance may not be loved or it may be built too high, but it is human to insist upon the wall, since the wall is built about man's most sacred institutions.

The second conclusion, that censorship is a universal phenomenon while man remains a free being, at once says that censorship is compatible with freedom. This implies the immediate distinction between liberty and license and demands a clear understanding of the nature of liberty.

Liberty is of its very nature restrictive. The exercise of human liberty is based upon the principle that the individual man is free. But an individual's freedom immediately implies that other men are free. That other men are free suggests responsibility toward other free beings, that their liberty be not abridged. Hence, the responsibility of freedom imports limitation of freedom. Hence, human liberty, of its nature, is limited and restrictive. As Georges Clemenceau once remarked, "liberty is the right to discipline oneself so as not to be disciplined by others."

License, on the other hand ("I can think, say, do what I please.") not only denies limitation, but also responsibility, from which limitation is deduced. Based upon no principle, license has no principle to limit it. Paradoxically, however,

precisely because it is based upon no principle, license is absolutely restrictive. The advocate of license, insisting that none may limit him in any way whatever, is in the sad position of arguing at one and the same time that, whereas none may limit what he will say or do, he himself may not limit what another will say or do. In other words, the advocate of license in speech and writing must insist that the censor has a right to censor him, since the censor has an arbitrary right, indeed a license, for self-expression. License is simply self-contradictory. License is not something, it is the absence of something. Using license to destroy license is simply defeating a nothing by means of itself. It is as if one could speak of anarchy destroying anarchy. If anarchy were something set up and established so that it could be destroyed, it would have ceased to be anarchy.

License is sub-human and to hold for license is to hold that man may act as irresponsibly as the brute. For man to lower himself to the level of brute creation is to usurp the Creator's powers, for a man is no more free to be inhuman than he is free not to be.

The third conclusion that may be drawn from history is that censorship is subject to certain general conditions for its proper operation. Since God has endowed man with the power to express himself in spoken and written words, the presumption of the right to speak and write what he thinks is in man's favor.

Censorship Conditional

The right of the community, religious or civil, to restrict man's prerogative is therefore not unqualified. What are the conditions under which censorship operates we shall only tentatively suggest, secretly wishing the while that we might rest content in Keats's state of ". . . *negative capability*, that is when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without an irritable reaching after fact and reason."

The first condition, however irritating this reaching after fact and reason may prove to be, is that *censorship must be evidently in the interest of the community as a whole, not of any part*. Since the individual has an established right to speak out, the right to restrict must be based on *evident* necessity. The possibility that at some future date harm may come or that some small group may be injured by an individual's speech or writing is not sufficient justification for repression. True, the welfare of the community as a whole may demand that a significant minority group, e.g., adolescents, be protected from harm, but in this case the community is justified in merely taking precautions that the work be not generally disseminated. The obvious application of the condition concerns a minority group which may find itself in power and censors, not for the welfare of the community as a whole, but for the benefit of itself. Such was the censorship of the

Nazis, for example, who throttled the expression of any view not their own. Their censorship was in violation of an evident human right.

Secondly, *censorship must be administered by prudent and responsible persons*. Even where the Church or the State has a clear right to censor in this or that case, the function of censorship, like every other function, must be exercised prudently and answerably. Perhaps even more administrative prudence is demanded on the part of the censor, since the matter in question often involves a very delicate human equation, and is of grave importance not only to the integrity of the individual but to the ultimate well-being of the society on whose behalf he censors. Prudence demands that censorship avoid any excess which would make its operation impossible, as in the case of Paul IV's prohibitions, and that it avoid taking unnecessary action, lest the publicity attendant upon the act of censorship prosper what it would prevent.

Thirdly, *censorship must be just and reasonable*. Unnecessary damage to the censored must be avoided, such as requiring him to go to needless expense to recall or destroy a work or to destroy the whole when expurgation is sufficient. It must be reasonable, i.e., it must observe a proportion between the good to be achieved and the means taken, which is to say that the method of censorship must conform to the rule of moderation. The censor, in other words, must not use an atomic can-

non when a pea-shooter will suffice.

Finally, *the censoring power must maintain a right intention*. A bad intention always vitiates an otherwise legitimate act. A dictator, for example, may act outwardly to vindicate—and actually vindicate—the welfare of the community as a whole by suppressing a certain news organ, but inwardly and really act to further a publication of his own. Such an action, as it stands, is immoral, though we concede that application of the principle of the double effect may save his subjective conscience. Again, a censoring power which would act out of jealousy or assert its authority merely for prestige, acts immorally.

That censorship must concern itself with the justice of its action is evidenced in the rules laid down by Benedict XIV for the guidance of the consultors and readers of the Congregation of the Holy Office. Redmond Burke, C.S.V., in *What Is the Index?*, admirably summarizes Benedict XIV's rules as follows:

1. The consultors are *not* to aim at condemnation of the work in question, but are to confine themselves to an impartial and unprejudiced examination . . .
2. A consultor must be skilled in the subject field treated in the book . . .
3. Prejudices based on patriotism, family ties, differences of religious orders or communities must be dismissed.
4. Judgment is not to be rendered until the book has been thoroughly read and studied . . . No judgment is to be passed on any proposition independent of the context . . .
5. If an author who has a reputation

for sound theological opinions uses ambiguous expressions, they are to be interpreted in a favorable sense.

Freedom Safeguarded

Benedict XIV's rules are obviously written with the integrity of the individual's freedom in mind. The right of the individual to speak the truth as he sees it is prior to the right of censorship. An individual has the right, even at times the obligation, to speak out against the entire community. Witness the Old Testament prophets. It is to our comfort that no great Western mind has yet said that the majority is always right, even though it most often rules.

The history of man is, from one

point of view, a sad and disillusioning wobble from left to right and back again, with only temporary moments of sobriety in the middle of the road. That man's career is not more of a career is due to his good sense, by which he first of all disciplines himself in what he says, submits to, rather than rejects, corrective authority, and when he wields censorial authority himself respects the individual because he understands his own freedom is not unlimited. And, while it is true that restriction is painful and "something there is that doesn't love a wall," still, because man is a social being, it is equally true that "good fences make good neighbors."



The New Soviet Leadership

The post-Stalinist leadership of Russia is more nearly rational than Stalin was, and, as Michael Lindsay has so brilliantly argued in his book, *China and the Cold War*, the worst excesses of Communist leaders can be more satisfactorily explained on the assumption that they are irrational than on the assumption that they are insincere in their adherence to the Marxist-Leninist ideology. The new leadership, because it is more rational, is more dangerous than Stalin, just as Stalin was more formidable than the carpet-gnawing Hitler.—Harold C. Hinton in *the COMMONWEAL*, June 29, 1956.

DOCUMENTATION

On Corneal Transplantation*

POPE PIUS XII

YOU HAVE asked Us, gentlemen, for a word of direction, approval and encouragement for your association, which hopes to aid the blind and those with impaired vision by means of the scientific and technical resources of modern surgery. We shall give you such a word in this brief address.

The abundant documentation you have procured for Us goes far beyond the specific subject We intend to discuss. It concerns the whole problem, which is growing more acute every day, of the transplantation of tissue from one person to another according to its various aspects: biological and medical, technical and surgical, juridical, moral and religious.

We shall limit Ourselves to the religious and moral aspects of the transplantation of the cornea, not between living men, of which We shall not speak today, but from a dead body to a living person. We shall be obliged, nevertheless, to go beyond these narrow limits to speak of some opinions We have encountered on this occasion.

We have examined the various reports you have sent Us. Their objectivity, seriousness and scientific precision, and the explanations they present of the necessary conditions for transplanting the cornea, as well as its diagnosis and prognosis, have made a profound impression on Us.

Morality of Heterografts

But before We start on Our specific topic, please let Us make two remarks of a more general nature. The terminology We have found in the reports and printed texts distinguishes between *autoinnesto* or autografts, the transfer of a person's issue from one part of his body to another; *omoinnesto* or homografts, the transfer of tissue from one individual to another individual of the same species (that is, from man to man), and *eteroinnesto* or heterografts, the transfer of tissues between two

*Address to a group of eye specialists, May 14, 1956.

individuals of different species (that is, between an animal and a human organism).

The last instance calls for some distinctions from the religious and moral point of view. It cannot be said that all biologically possible transplantations of tissue between individuals of different species are to be morally condemned. But it is still less true to say that any biologically possible heterogeneous transplantation is permissible or free from objection. One must make distinctions between cases and see which tissue or organ is involved in the transplanting.

The grafting of animal sex glands on man is to be rejected as immoral. On the other hand, the transplanting of the cornea from a non-human organism to a human organism, if it is biologically possible and warranted, does not raise the least objection.

If one wished to base an absolute moral ban against tissue transplantation on the differences between species, he would logically have to declare cellular therapy, which is being practiced with increasing frequency, immoral. Living cells are often taken from a non-human organism and transplanted into a human organism where they carry out their function.

We have also found among the *terminological* explanations of the most recently published work a remark which touches on the theme of Our present address. It is specified there that the expression "*innesto*" (graft), used to designate the transfer of parts of a dead body to living men, is inaccurate and improperly used. The text says: "The use of 'fixed' tissue (dead or preserved) has improperly come to be called 'grafting'; actually it would be more exact to speak of 'implanting' or 'enclosing' a dead tissue in a living tissue."

It is up to you to evaluate this statement from the medical point of view. From the philosophical and theological point of view the criticism is justified. The transfer of tissue or an organ from a corpse to a living man is not a transfer from man to man. The corpse *was* a man, but it is a man no longer.

We have also picked up another remark in the printed documentation which leads to confusion and which We think should be rectified. To show that the removal of organs which are needed for transplantation from one living being to another is in conformity with nature and lawful, it has been put on the same footing as the removal of a certain physical organ carried out in the interests of a whole physical organism. The organs of the individual would in this instance be considered as

parts and organs of the whole organism of "humanity," in the same way—or in almost the same way—as they are parts of the individual organism of man. It is argued that since it is permissible, when necessary, to sacrifice a particular member—hand, foot, eye, ear, kidney or sex gland—to the organism "man," it should be equally permissible to sacrifice a particular member to the organism "humanity" in the person of one of its sick and suffering members. The goal at which this argument aims—curing the illness of another or at least ameliorating it—is understandable and praiseworthy. But the method proposed and the reasoning with which it is supported are erroneous.

Here the essential difference between a physical organism and a moral organism is ignored, as is also the essential qualitative difference between the relations of the parts to the whole in these two types of organism.

The Moral Organism of "Humanity"

The physical organism of "man" is a whole with regard to being. Its members are parts united and linked with each other in regard to its very physical existence. They are so absorbed by the whole that they have no independence at all. They exist only for the total organism and have no other end but that of the whole being.

It is completely different in regard to the moral organism of "humanity." Humanity is a whole only in regard to act and finality. The individual members of this organism are only functional parts. The "whole" can therefore make demands on them only concerning the order of action. As for their physical being, the individuals are not in the least dependent on one another nor on humanity as a whole. Immediate evidence and common sense show the falsity of any contrary assertion.

For this reason the whole organism of humanity has no right to impose on the individual any demands in the realm of physical being by virtue of the natural law that the "whole" may dispose of its parts. The removal of a particular organ would be a case of direct intervention, not only in the sphere of action of the individual, but also and principally in the sphere of his being, by a purely functional "whole," that is by "humanity," "society" or the "state," in which the individual is incorporated as a functional member with regard to action only.

In a wholly different context We previously emphasized the meaning and importance of this consideration and pointed out the necessary distinction which must be carefully made between a physical and a moral organism. In Our encyclical of June 29, 1943, on the Mystical

Body of Christ, We summarized what We have just said in a few sentences which might not have been immediately understood by non-theologians because of their conciseness. After an attentive reading of these sentences, however, non-theologians can come to a better understanding of the difference between the relation of the whole to a part in a physical and in a moral organism.

At that time it was necessary to explain how the simple believer is a part of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and the difference between that relationship and the relationship which exists within a physical organism. We wrote then:

In a natural body the principle of unity so unites the parts that each lacks its own individual subsistence. In the Mystical Body, on the contrary, that mutual union, though intrinsic, links the members by a bond which leaves the personality of each intact. Besides, if we examine the relationship existing between the various members and between the members and the head, in every living physical body all the different members are ultimately directed only towards the good of the whole, while every moral association of men, if we look to its ultimate usefulness, is in the end directed towards the advancement of each and every single member, since they are all persons.

Psychology of the Blind

Let Us return to Our principal theme, the moral evaluation of the transplantation of a cornea from a dead body to a living person in order to ameliorate the condition of the blind or of those who are becoming blind. Today the charity and piety of many compassionate men, with their inventive resources, audacity and perseverance, are placed at the service of the blind, as is also the progress of technology and scientific surgery. The psychology of the blind allows us to understand their need for sympathetic aid and their gratitude on receiving it.

The Gospel of St. Luke contains a vivid description of the psychology of the blind which is a masterpiece. A blind man of Jericho, hearing a crowd passing by, asked what was happening. He was told that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. Then he cried out, "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me!"

The people told him to keep quiet, but he called out even louder, "Son of David, have mercy on me!" Jesus then commanded that the man be brought to Him.

"What wouldst thou have me do for thee?"

"Lord, that I may see."

"Receive thy sight, thy faith has saved thee."

And at once he received his sight and followed Jesus, praising God. (Lk. 18, 35-43.)

This cry—"Lord, that I may see!"—re-echoes in the ears and hearts of everyone. You, too, want to answer it and offer as much help as possible. You assure Us that the transfer of the cornea is for many of the sick a promising means of curing or at least of improving their condition.

Well, use it and help them as far as it is possible and lawful to do so, naturally choosing your cases with great discernment and prudence.

The Operation Itself

The documentation which you have given to Us allows Us to some extent to imagine the operation you perform. The removal of the cornea may be effected, you say, in two ways: by "lamellar keratoplasty" (peeling the cornea from the eyeball) or by "perforant keratoplasty" (cutting out the cornea from the eyeball). If the required technique is carefully observed, the removed eye can be preserved from 48 to 60 hours. If several clinics are not too far from one another, they can set up a certain reserve of material ready for use and can be prepared to aid one another according to the needs of particular cases.

We also find in your documentation information concerning the need for transplanting the cornea and the possibilities of success. The majority of the blind and those who are becoming blind cannot profit from the operation. You guard against utopian hopes in the prognosis of operable cases. You have written: "It is good that the public should know that transplants of other eye tissues are not possible and still less any that involve the interior of a man's eye. It is possible only to substitute partially the more anterior portion of the visual mechanism."

As for the success of the operation, you tell Us that out of 4,360 case histories published between 1948 and 1954, from 45 to 65 per cent of the cases have had a positive result, and that a similar percentage is to be found in cases which have not been written up. You add: "As a result of these experiences gains have been made." In only 20 per cent of your cases have you been able to attain "a more or less normal vision."

You point out in conclusion that in many countries the laws and ordinances do not permit a large scale use of cornea transplantations and that consequently a great number of blind persons and those who are losing their sight cannot be helped. So much for what concerns your work from the medical and technical point of view.

From the religious and moral point of view there is no objection to

the removal of the cornea from a corpse. This means that there is no objection to lamellar or perforant keratoplasties when they are considered *in themselves*. For the person who receives them, that is to say for the patient, they represent a restoration or the correction of a congenital defect or accident.

With regard to the corpse from which the cornea is removed, they do not take away any property to which it has a right nor remove its right to that property. A corpse is no longer, in the proper sense of the word, a subject of rights. The operation is no longer the removal of property. The visual organs—their presence and integrity—no longer have the character of property in a corpse, for they no longer serve it and no longer have a relation to any end.

This does not at all mean that in regard to the corpse of a man there cannot be, and are not in fact, moral obligations, prescriptions or prohibitions. Nor does it mean that those responsible for the care of a body, for its integrity and the treatment to which it will be subjected cannot, and do not in fact, transfer their rights and duties properly so called. Quite the contrary, keratoplasties, which do not in themselves raise any moral objection, may not for other reasons be beyond reproach and may even be specifically immoral.

First, We must denounce a morally erroneous mental judgment which often influences the behavior of men. This judgment consists of putting the human corpse on the same level as that of an animal or a simple "thing."

Almost all the parts of an animal's corpse are usable. The same thing can be said of the human corpse considered in a purely material way, that is to say, in terms of the elements of which it is composed. For some people this way of looking at it constitutes the final criterion of thought and the ultimate principle of action.

Such an attitude is an error of judgment and a misunderstanding of psychology and of religious and moral feelings. For the human corpse deserves to be regarded in a completely different way. The corpse was the dwelling place of a spiritual and immortal soul, an essential constituent part of a human person whose dignity it shares. Because it is a part of man it can also be said that it has been formed in "the image and likeness" of God. This likeness goes far beyond the generic traces of resemblance to God that is also found in animals without intelligence and even in inanimate and purely material things.

In a way the words of the Apostle apply even to a corpse: "Do you

not know that your members are the temple of the Holy Spirit, who is in you?" (1 Cor. 6; 19). Finally, the dead body is destined for resurrection and life eternal.

All this is not true of an animal's corpse and proves that in order to judge and treat the human corpse in a suitable manner it is not enough to envisage "therapeutic ends." On the other hand, it is equally true that medical science and the training of future physicians require a detailed knowledge of the human body and that cadavers are needed for study. What We have just said does not forbid this. One can pursue this legitimate end while fully accepting what We have just said.

It also happens that an individual may want to dispose of his corpse and destine it to useful ends that are morally irreproachable and even elevated (among others to help his sick and suffering fellowmen). One can make such a decision with regard to his own body with the full knowledge of the respect that will be given him, and taking into account the words that the Apostle addressed to the Corinthians. This decision should not be condemned, but positively justified. Think, for example, of the gesture of Don Carlo Gnocchi.

Freedom of Persons Concerned

Unless circumstances impose an obligation, the freedom and spontaneity of the persons concerned must be respected. Usually, however, such a decision should not be presented as a *duty* or an act of obligatory charity. In urging such a decision an intelligent reserve must certainly be observed in order to avoid serious internal and external conflicts.

Is it necessary, moreover, as is often done, to refuse in principle all compensation? The question remains unanswered. It is without doubt true that grave abuses could be introduced if payment is demanded. But it would be going too far to judge immoral all demands or acceptances of compensation. The matter is similar to blood transfusions. It is meritorious for the donor to refuse compensation. It is not necessarily a fault to accept it.

The removal of the cornea, although perfectly licit in itself, can become illicit if it violates the rights and feelings of those who are responsible for the care of a body, primarily the next of kin. But these could be other persons by virtue of public or private laws. It would not be human to serve the interests of medicine or "therapeutic ends" while ignoring these deep feelings.

In general, doctors should not be permitted to undertake removals

or other interventions on a corpse without the agreement of the persons who are responsible for it, perhaps even in spite of their previous objections. Nor would it be any more equitable for the bodies of poor patients in public clinics and hospitals to be officially destined for medical and surgical use, while those of more fortunate patients were not. Money and social position should not count when it is a question of sparing such delicate human feelings.

On the other hand the public must be educated. One must explain with intelligence and respect that to consent expressly or tacitly to serious damage to the integrity of a corpse in the interest of those who suffer is not, when there are valid reasons for it, an offense against the respect due the dead. This consent may, in spite of everything, bring suffering and sacrifice to the next of kin, but the sacrifice is crowned with merciful charity towards suffering brothers.

Public authorities and the laws which concern operations on corpses must in general be guided by the same moral and human considerations, for they are founded on human nature itself, which precedes society in the order of causality and dignity. In particular, public authorities have the duty to see to their application and especially to take measures so that a "corpse" is not considered and treated as such before death has been duly established.

On the other hand, public authorities are competent to take care of the legitimate interests of medicine and medical training. If it is suspected that death is due to a criminal cause, or if there is any danger to public health, the corpse must be handed over to the authorities. All this can and must be done without any lack of respect to the human corpse or to the rights of the next of kin. Public authorities may, finally, contribute effectively to making the necessity and moral lawfulness of certain dispositions of the corpse enter into public opinion, and thus anticipate or avoid the possibility of internal and external conflict in regard to the individual, the family and society.

Almost two years ago, on September 30, 1954, We expressed the same idea in an address to the 8th Congress of the International Medical Association. We should now like to repeat and confirm what We said then in a brief paragraph:

Concerning the removal of parts of the body of a deceased person for therapeutic purposes, one cannot permit the physician to treat the corpse as he wishes. It is up to public authorities to establish suitable rules. But neither can the public authorities proceed arbitrarily. There are laws against which

serious objections can be raised. A law which would permit a doctor in a hospital to take parts of a corpse for therapeutic purposes—any question of profit being excluded—is not admissible because of the possibility of interpreting it too freely.

It is also necessary to take into consideration the rights and duties of those who are responsible for the bodies of the dead. Finally, one must respect the requirements of natural morality, which forbid considering and treating a man's corpse like a thing or like the corpse of an animal (*Addresses and Radio Speeches*, VI. 16, p. 176).

With the hope that you have been given a more precise and simpler orientation and a more profound understanding of the religious and moral aspects of this topic, We grant you with all Our heart Our apostolic blessing.



The Secular Mind

The secular cast of mind can exist even with pious practices—witness the Catholic mother wearing her sodality ribbon on Sunday morning. The same afternoon she is bemoaning to a friend the “hard” Church laws which seem to be “blighting” the life of her married daughter. (“The Church will have to relax in these matters, or else . . .”) The sodality ribbon—but the secular mind.—*Mother M. Oliver, I.B.V.M., in SURSUM CORDA*, June, 1956.



The Will Not Enough

The Communists have nothing over us when it comes to willingness to sacrifice. But they score almost every time when it comes to preparation for work in the social, industrial and political spheres. It is up to us to surpass them. We, too, can enormously increase our impact upon the modern world by means of an elite—dedicated but also well instructed and specially trained for the job.—*Douglas Hyde in HIBERNIA*, June, 1956.

Church and State*

THE SASKATCHEWAN HIERARCHY

DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST:

SASKATCHEWAN'S Golden Jubilee provides an excellent opportunity for the study of our Christian concept of civil and religious authority as well as the corresponding privileges, rights and duties of the citizens. As the Province passes its golden milestone this year, its phenomenal development is being published far and wide and tribute paid to its sturdy pioneers. It is eminently fitting then that adequate recognition should be accorded the Catholic Church—one of the largest religious groups in the Province from its earliest days. For throughout these 50 years the rapid progress in civic and economic spheres was paralleled by the steady expansion of the Catholic Church.

Moreover, during all these years, the Saskatchewan episcopate has consistently vindicated those basic principles which the Canadian Hierarchy so succinctly reaffirmed in its classical statement of January 18, 1945. Reviewing now the relationship between Church and State during this first half century of Saskatchewan's autonomy, though the Church, to adhere tenaciously to the Christian principles propounded by Leo XIII, had to vindicate her sacred tenets on some important matters, we may state that, as a general rule, amity and peace, even praiseworthy harmony and co-operation have prevailed, and, in consequence, both the Government and the Catholic Church, each in its own sphere, has been enabled to make the maximum contribution to the steady and harmonious evolution of our Province.

This spirit of tolerance and good will which was exhibited so frequently in local communities as well as in the higher levels of government has almost everywhere revealed an implicit and spontaneous mutual respect. On the part of our Catholic citizens, their sterling civic virtue and consequent generous contribution to the development of our Province is a concrete reflection of the sound doctrine which the illustrious Pope

*A joint pastoral letter of the Archbishop and Bishops of Saskatchewan to the clergy and laity on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee of the Province, Regina, Sask., Canada, July 17, 1955.

Leo XIII so lucidly set forth 70 years ago in his encyclical on "*The Christian Constitution of States*."¹ This inspiring Leonine doctrine we now propose to expound as a Catholic contribution to this Jubilee year of Saskatchewan.

I

The State

The Catholic doctrine on the Church and State is set forth with admirable conciseness by Pope Leo XIII. He embodies its basis in these words:

God has divided the government of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil; the one being set over the Divine, the other over human things. Each is supreme in its own sphere; each has fixed limits within which it moves. Each is circumscribed by its own orbit, within which it lives and works in its own natural right.

In a subsequent encyclical he re-emphasizes the source of governmental authority, saying: "True and legitimate authority is devoid of sanction unless it proceed from God, the supreme Ruler and Lord of all."²

In these and similar passages the Popes have constantly echoed the division of authority to govern between Church and State which is implicit in Christ's own mandate: "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's,"³ and also placed the source of that authority to govern in "one sole and single source, namely God," as did St. Paul in the words: "There is no power but from God."⁴

In this two-fold fundamental doctrine we are at one with St. Augustine's "On the City of God"⁵ in the 4th century and with Dom. Anscar Vonier's classical *Christianus* in our own day.⁶ Reject this doctrine and there is removed the barrier to the discredited theories of the "Divine Right of Kings," and of the Absolute State, the Leviathan.⁷ This is a vital and fundamental doctrine, for the sanction for the authority of the State must lie outside the State itself. Otherwise, the State would be omnipotent. Basing its authority on its own laws, it would necessarily degenerate into a tyranny or perish in anarchy, as is painfully illustrated in

¹ Leo XIII, Encyclical: *Immortale Dei*, Nov. 1, 1885.

² Leo XIII, Encyclical: *Sapientiae Christianae*, Jan. 10, 1890.

³ Mark 13:17.

⁴ Rom. 13:1.

⁵ *De moribus Eccl. Cath.* XXX, 63; Cf. Leo XIII, Encyc. *Imm. Dei*.

⁶ Cf. *Christianus*, Dom. Anscar Vonier; Ch. XV, *Christianus Civis*.

⁷ Pius XII, Encyc. *Summi Pontificatus*, Oct. 20, 1939.

every country where totalitarianism has prevailed in recent years, e.g., Communism, Nazism, or Fascism.

While the Church affirms that the source of authority is God, the special form or mode of government must be determined by local needs and conditions. The Catholic Church, throughout history, has existed parallel with, and under, every form of government. It outlived the Roman Emperors and tyrants; it saw the downfall of countless monarchies; it is vigorous today under many forms of democracy, and it battles, as always, in vindication of God's right, with every modern dictatorship.

With the great Leo XIII we teach that the "right to rule is not necessarily bound up with any special mode of government. It may take this form or that form, provided only it be of such a form as to ensure the general welfare."⁸ Amplifying this principle, Rev. W. Keane, S.J., lucidly explains:

Just as when the Pope is elected, the choice is made by the Cardinals, but the gift of infallibility comes from God, so we may say that when rulers are designated by whatever method is adopted to ensure stable government, the gift of authority comes to them from God; directly from God, as some Catholic philosophers hold; indirectly from God, through the people, as other Catholic philosophers prefer to say. But as authority ultimately comes from God to rulers, obedience is a duty imposed by the law of God. Hence loyalty is for Catholics not an emotion nor a prejudice; it is a commandment of God, which, when authority is lawfully exercised, it would be sin to disobey.⁹

For a Catholic, therefore, "it is a matter of justice and duty to obey them, and to show them reverence and fealty, united to a love not unlike that which children show their parents, for our rulers hold authority from God."¹⁰ Such is the exalted deference which the Catholic Church accords the State. Obedient to the Divine mandate, the Church fully concedes to the government the things that belong to the Government.

II

The Church

Side by side with the State exists the Catholic Church. The Church is a religious society with a Divine commission to render to God the things that are God's. Like the State, the Church is made up of men.

⁸ Leo XIII, *Encyc. Imm. Dei*. Cf. also Pius XII, Christmas Message, 1944.

⁹ Melbourne Advocate, Rev. W. Keane, S.J., May 29, 1930.

¹⁰ Leo XIII, *Encyc. Imm. Dei*.

Whereas the State envisions the temporal welfare of men, the Church seeks their spiritual and eternal welfare. Where the State utilizes temporal and material means to its end, the Church uses spiritual and material means to achieve the aim and purpose of its existence. The Church, therefore, having received Christ's own authority, is a supernatural and spiritual society, and, having the noblest of all ends, "its authority is the most exalted of all authority."¹¹

The Church does not consider it her "province to decide which is the best among many forms of government . . . and, amidst the various kinds of State rule, she does not disapprove of any, provided the respect due to religion and the observance of good morals be upheld."¹² On another occasion, the great Leo XIII wrote: "Of the various forms of government, the Church does not reject any that are fitted to procure the welfare of the subject."¹³ Hence, the Church wishes to live in peace and justice and concord with every government, not injecting itself into the civil affairs of government, but demanding that the government likewise respect her divine commission and not inject itself into her spiritual affairs.

On her part, the Church offers her full co-operation in building a citizenry which is spiritual-minded and law-abiding, and in training men for the discharge of their duties as citizens—for the Church is well aware that a good citizen is first of all a good man.

This civic service is well couched in the words of the late Rev. Francis X. Talbot, S.J., who wrote:

The Church aspires to assist government in every movement for the betterment of social conditions, for economic reform, for the abolition of class bitterness, for the advancement of education and the sciences and the arts, for prosperity, for the preservation of peace and order within the jurisdiction of the government, and for the promotion of peace in world affairs. In a word, the Church offers civil government all its spiritual influence, all the civic loyalty of itself and its members, all its practical idealism, all its patriotism and allegiance.¹⁴

If the Church renders so eminent a service to the State, she still repudiates every effort to enslave her and to make her the handmaiden

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

¹² Leo XIII, *Encyc. Sap. Christ.*

¹³ Leo XIII, *Encyc. Libertas Humana*, June 20, 1888.

Cf. also Pius XII, Christmas Message, 1944.

¹⁴ Cf. *Catholic Mind*, May 22, 1938, p. 189 seq.

of the State. Her mission is pre-eminently spiritual, as Pope Leo XIII points out:

It is the Church, and not the State, that is to be man's guide to heaven. It is to the Church that God has assigned the charge of seeing to and legislating for, all that concerns religion; of teaching all nations; of spreading the Christian faith as widely as possible; in short, of administering freely and without hindrance, in accordance with her own judgment, all matters that fall within her competence.¹⁵

III

Harmony and Discord

Among scholars, a discussion of the union or separation of Church and State has long been carried on. In recent years, much light has been shed on the various theories of Church-State relations in a series of articles in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* and *Theological Studies*. An excellent synopsis of these is presented by Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., in *Theology Digest*.¹⁶ Actually, history offers ample testimony that an intimate union has not always been an unmixed blessing to the Church. On the other hand, separation has often entailed restrictions which hampered the Church in her divine mission.

Pope Leo XIII clearly affirms that "there must exist between these two powers, a certain orderly connection, which may be compared to the union of the soul and body in man. The nature and scope of that connection can be determined only by having regard to the nature of each power and by taking account of the relative excellence and nobleness of their purpose. One of the two has for its proximate and chief object the well-being of this mortal life; the other the everlasting joys of heaven. Whatever, therefore, in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church. Whatever is to be ranged under the civil and political order is rightly subject to the civil authority."¹⁷

From this we must infer the primacy of the spiritual and "the objective subordination of the temporal end of man to his supernatural end," so that "it is evident that the Church, as a religious society instituted by

¹⁵ Leo XIII, *Encyc. Imm. Dei*.

¹⁶ *Theology Digest*, No. 3, Autumn, 1953; p. 169 seq.

¹⁷ Leo XIII, *Encyc. Imm. Dei*.

God precisely for the supernatural end, cannot be dependent on the State."¹⁸

The whole doctrine of Church-State relations is very concisely summarized in these words of the Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J. He writes:

It is important for both Catholics and non-Catholics clearly to understand that there is no question on our part of even remotely desiring or preferring a union of Church and State in a country of diversified religions and of people with no religion, such as the United States. On the other hand, it must be clear to everyone that such a union would be ideal in a Catholic civilization where all men recognize Christ's Kingship, and where consequently it would ensure the perfect co-operation of secular and ecclesiastical powers. It is a very different matter where there is question of relations between the Church and the typical modern lay State. In condemning, therefore, the proposition, that "the State must be separated from the Church, and the Church from the State," the Syllabus indicates that is false to say that a separation of Church and State is demanded by the very nature of things. In conditions as they ought to be the normal relationship would be one of close co-operation. Similarly we must avoid falling into the popular error of referring to every instance of co-operation of Church and profane State, or to every indirect influence exercised by the Church upon the lay State in relation to morals and religion, as a union of Church and State.¹⁹

As already stated the Church has for its end man's spiritual welfare; the State his material well-being. Both are perfect societies, distinct from each other, yet mutually complementary, much like the body and soul in man. And, as in man, there is an interaction, and sometimes conflict, between his material and spiritual interest, so also there are areas in human living in which the respective powers of Church and State are both concerned, and in which therefore, conflicts may arise. In such a case, as Leo XIII explicitly teaches, for the sake of peace and liberty the Church seeks an understanding with the State "by showing the greatest kindness and indulgence."²⁰ Hence, she has negotiated scores of Concordats, *Modus Vivendi* and other agreements in the course of the centuries. When however a vital principle is at stake, e.g., in matters of education or marriage or other matters affecting moral and spiritual life, she cannot surrender her authority, and in such instances her inexorable steadfastness has not infrequently brought persecution upon her.

Because truth is immutable and principles immortal, the Church,

¹⁸ Cf. *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology*, Pietro Parente, p. 268.

¹⁹ Cf. *Social Wellings*, Vol. I, compilation of documents by Pope Leo XIII;

Cf. footnote, p. 82.

²⁰ Leo XIII, *Encyc. Imm. Dei*. Cf. also, Parente, *on. cit.* p. 269.

faithful guardian of both, in her deathless doctrine has provided the social leaven and remedy for every ill which has afflicted Christianity during two millennia. Down through the ages, she has asserted the substantial equality of all men, the dignity of labor and even the blessedness of spiritual poverty. Braving the hatred and vengeance of tyrants in every age, she has championed the natural rights of man, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Not with fire and sword, but by emulating the meekness of the Divine Shepherd and proclaiming the eternal verities which Divine Wisdom had revealed, has she challenged the arrogance of worldly power and promoted the reign of unity and justice, peace and love among peoples and nations.

No worldly greed for power has ever made her its servile instrument. On the contrary, she has defied every tyrant and oppressor and faithfully vindicated the rights of the people and the Church and the liberties of society. In defense of the weak and persecuted, she secured the right of sanctuary to the oppressed; she enacted canons against the wanton waste of human life; she instituted the Truce of God to arrest and mitigate the cruelties of war. To the Church, the whole world is indebted for harboring and cultivating the arts, the sciences, and the literature of the ancient world.²¹

In a word, whatever is worthwhile in civilization is linked to Christianity. Even Jean Jacques Rousseau was constrained to concede that modern governments "owe to Christianity their stability and the escape from frequent revolutions." Such analogous blessings too, the Catholic Church, availing itself of its freedom, has conferred upon our Province of Saskatchewan.

IV

Patriotism

But much more the Church wants to give to the State and Society. Ever a messenger of mercy and love, the Church is painfully aware that men are becoming oblivious of the principles of Christian morality and that they are frequently ignoring the Law of Sinai and the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount. Her whole history confirms her conviction that the exclusive pursuit of merely material welfare will bring disillusionment, and that man must pursue ideals as well as those spiritual

²¹ *Catholic Mind Through 50 Years*, Cf. Frederic Siedenburg, S.J., p. 169 seq.

realities which are the basis of her social gospel, if enduring peace and tranquillity are to be restored to an agonized humanity.

Conscious of all this, the Church today places particular emphasis on genuine practical patriotism. Its essence is not easily defined nor is it confined to one country or a particular period of history. Ancient pagan philosophers like Cicero were lyrical in its praise. Christian doctrine has ever deemed it a virtue and the basis of good citizenship.

As Father Thomas Slater points out, patriotism is not a blind, irrational impulse, nor yet a prejudice, but rather a virtue which must be guarded from excess as well as defect.²² Father William Turner calls it more than an instinct, or a sentiment, though these are exalted by emotion and clarified by ideas.²³ As a virtue, the ancients called it *pietas*, or a filial reverence for the fatherland. St. Thomas describes it as a natural virtue like justice, of which it is a part.²⁴ Pope Benedict XIV stresses it as a part also of the cardinal virtue of prudence. In brief, its analysis and description are by no means easy.

To the pagan it was an emotional urge which inspired acts of heroism, but for the Christian it is much more. By associating it with the moral virtues, patriotism for the Christian becomes exalted and supernaturalized. In its essence, patriotism is love of country. It embodies the citizen's basic duties to his country. It embraces obedience to law, respect for authority, and loyalty. Its foundation and guide is the moral law which in turn is the natural law of God.

Patriotism, therefore, must be well-ordered and rational to be practical; otherwise, it becomes an exaggeration and perversion. Lack of patriotism connotes disloyalty and neglect of a citizen's duty to his country. On the other hand, exaggerated patriotism is irrational and leads to the patently immoral doctrine hidden in the expression: "My country, right or wrong." It is precisely through the cultivation of inordinate patriotism that totalitarian governments debase the virtue into ultra-nationalism and this is carried to the extreme where the citizen is compelled to acquiesce in various form of injustice.²⁵

The Catholic citizen, therefore, remembers that patriotism is a moral virtue whereby he fulfills his duty to his country, without forgetting that all men are brothers and members of the great human family, and

²² *Christ and Evolution*, p. 162 seq.

²³ Cf. *Catholic Mind*, May 22, 1921.

²⁴ *Summa*, II, ii, q. 101, a. 3.

²⁵ Pius XI, *Encyc. Ubi Arcano*; Cf. *Social Wellsprings*, Vol. II, p. 3.

that other nations have an equal right with ourselves to life and prosperity.²⁶ The Christian doctrine of patriotism tells us to love and loyally serve our country, but at the same time curbs all excess and extravagance. It emphasizes that not only justice, but charity as well, sanctions and enforces the duty of patriotism. This Catholic concept is very necessary in the modern world. It provides the golden mean between the vices of excess and defect.

Like all virtues, patriotism should be so cultivated that it becomes habitual, that it influences our outlook and the actions of our daily life. It must prompt us to respect our country's laws and obey them; to reverence legitimate authority and sustain it. It binds us to pay our just taxes and other forms of levy. It impels us—and this is of utmost importance in a democracy such as ours—to exercise our privilege as voters and to cast our ballot conscientiously. Christian patriotism, moreover, imposes the obligation of promoting good citizenship, of advancing every patriotic cause, of encouraging every enterprise which redounds to the benefit and credit of our country; in a word, of being public-spirited citizens.²⁷

V

Rights and Duties of Citizens

Before elaborating more fully the citizen's rights and duties which co-exist with patriotism, we must recall certain fundamental tenets which were enunciated previously in this letter.

Many political scientists and writers today deny the existence of the natural law and derive all rights of the citizen from the State. They assert that any immunities, rights and guarantees which the citizen enjoys are granted by the law or the constitution of the State. Accordingly, the State could deprive the citizen of any or all rights at its whim and arbitrarily take away his liberty, property and even life. What tragic instability and insecurity for the citizen would eventuate if this crass doctrine were generally accepted!²⁸

Fortunately in our country and province a traditional Christian basis safeguards most of the citizen's rights. If our Christian theory of Church and State as outlined above is acknowledged by the State and perpetuated by the liberty of the Church, the soundest possible foundation is

²⁶ *Ibidem*; Cf. also Leo XIII, *Encyc. Imm. Dei*.

²⁷ Cf. Turner, *Catholic Mind*, May 22, 1921.

²⁸ Ryan, John A. *The Catholic Church and the Citizen*, p. 85.

given the State and an inviolable security is assured the citizen. Placing the source of all authority in God, no human power can deprive the citizen of his rights. At the same time, this theory provides a natural and eternal sanction for the performance of the duties of the citizen.

What are the rights of the citizen? They are of two kinds: the rights which he has as a man and those which he holds from the fact of belonging to a particular temporal society. The first are commonly called human rights and the other civic rights.²⁹

The human rights of man are inherent and inalienable rights which are conferred upon the citizen as a man by his human nature and the natural law. Examples of these are: the right to life, the right of freedom of worship and the right to live in society, since man is a person, a child of God, and a social being respectively, and this three-fold status derives not from any State but from the very nature of man and therefore from natural law.³⁰

Other natural rights flowing from the nature of man, although not immediately, usually are called relative natural rights. They are: freedom of movement, freedom from political oppression, freedom of education. In a similar category we must number other derived rights such as the right of private property, the right to marry, the right to work, the right of nationality, the right of social security, etc. Many of these rights and some of their immediate applications have been recognized by the civil authority and have been embodied in the constitutions of many States. On account of this inclusion they are often called, although improperly, civic rights. The State thus exercises the role of protector of the human rights of man.

But besides these human rights which are sometimes called civic rights, the State in the pursuit of its specific end which is the temporal happiness of man and the prosperity of the civil society, will grant particular rights to the citizens and impose on them civic duties which are necessary or useful for the common good. These can at times be limited or altered by the State when and if the necessity or usefulness of

²⁹ Cf. *Code of International Ethics*, edited by John Eppstein, (1953), p. 194 seq.

Cf. also, p. 242 seq. and *Catholic Mind*, March 1948, p. 146.

³⁰ Cf. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., *Catholic Mind*, March, 1948, p. 146 seq.

Cf. also, Ryan, op. cit. p. 85 seq.

them has disappeared. Such were, for instance, the Homestead Laws in early Saskatchewan.²¹ As a protector and guardian of the human rights of man the State will exercise due vigilance over the possible abuse of such rights.

Since rights and duties are correlative, every patriotic citizen has duties corresponding to the rights set forth above. So vital and important to the commonweal are these obligations that Catholic theologians assign them to a special kind of justice which they call legal justice.²² It binds all members, the ruler as well as the citizen, to render to the community what is due it for the common good.²³

This virtue of legal justice obliges public officials to acquire that adequate knowledge which their office postulates and to promote the social welfare of the citizens without seeking private gain and personal advantage at the expense of the public welfare. It forbids the public official to accept bribes or "graft," or to seek special advantages for his friends or to confer special favors upon individuals or upon a class.

In a letter that is already a classic, written to Charles Flory, President of the *Semaines Sociales*, on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee Convention at Rennes, July 20-25, 1954, His Holiness Pope Pius XII gives timely directives on the "Crisis of State and Citizenship." With magisterial precision he reminds the Catholics citizen of his obligation to set an example of civic virtue. "In a democratic State," he asserts, "civic life imposes stiff demands on the moral maturity of each citizen." He rebukes "lack of interest in public affairs . . . "financial frauds," and "the sterile criticism of authority and self-centered defense of privileges in contempt of the general interest." Speaking of public officials, he reminds them of his Christmas Message, 1944, when he admonished them to "protect the liberties of the citizen," to "exercise their activity with firmness and independence . . . with appreciation of their own obligations, with objectivity, impartiality, loyalty, generosity and integrity."²⁴

Therefore, the State and its officials have a strict obligation to provide protection and assistance to every social class so that it may enjoy a right and reasonable life. Pertinent in this respect is the admonition of Pope Leo XIII: "Among the many and grave duties of rulers who would

²¹ Parsons, Ryan, op. cit.

Cf. also Maritain, Jacques, *The Rights of Man and Natural Law*, English ed. pp. 65-66, pp. 79-80, pp. 111-114.

²² Vermeersch, *de iustitia*, p. 39 seq.

²³ Leibell, *Readings in Ethics*, Ryan, p. 987 seq.

²⁴ Cf. *Catholic Mind*, Nov. 1954, p. 691 seq.

do their best for their people, the first and chief is to act with strict justice—with that justice which is called by the schoolmen distributive—towards each and every class alike.⁷⁵

The first and most comprehensive duty of the private citizen, on the other hand, must be, as Cardinal Griffin pointed out in a Pastoral Letter for Lent 1948: "to set an example of good citizenship."⁷⁶ This entails the general obligation of respect and loyalty to public officials and their enactments. Regardless of their personal worth, public officials are custodians of political authority and as such they have a right to esteem and consideration. Catholics are particularly cautioned against that narrow political partisanship which denies to legitimate public officials the honor which is their due. This would be a serious perversion of the first and general duty of the good citizen.

Another general duty of the good citizen is obedience to law. This duty embraces all just laws and enactments, whether national, provincial or municipal. In addition to obedience, loyalty is an essential characteristic of a good citizen. Loyalty demands that a citizen be always ready, not only to obey the law, but also to have an habitual and spontaneous attitude whereby the citizen gives the "benefit of the doubt" to his government and its laws, and refrains from unwarranted and unsubstantiated or carping criticism and distrust.⁷⁷

The specific duties of the citizen are of two kinds: elementary and complex. Elementary duties exist under all forms of government. The most important of these are taxation and military service. As regards taxation, it may be asserted, with the majority of moral theologians, that this duty of paying one's proportionate share of taxes, as well as that of providing a statement of taxable property, is certainly incumbent on the citizen by virtue of legal justice. The other elementary duty of the citizen is that of military service when required by law.⁷⁸

The second class of specific duties may be called complex. These exist only in a State which has representative government such as ours. In such a State, good government depends upon the intelligence and morality of the voters. Therefore, the citizen has the obligation to use the franchise intelligently and conscientiously. This means that the citizen must take an active part in politics, study the programs of the

⁷⁵ Leo XIII, *Encyc. Rerum Novarum*, May 15, 1891.

⁷⁶ Cf. *Catholic Mind*, August, 1948, p. 534.

⁷⁷ Leibell, *op. cit.* p. 990.

⁷⁸ Ryan, *op. cit.* p. 65; Cf. also, Leibell, *op. cit.* p. 996 seq.

various political parties, inform himself concerning the qualifications of the various candidates, exert his influence to give a Christian complexion and sound moral principles to the political platforms, and finally cast his ballot, not by inclination or prejudice, but conscientiously for the common welfare.

Timely in this respect is the exhortation of Pope Pius XII in his Christmas Message for 1944. He reminds voters to select as their representatives, men of "high moral standards, practical ability and intellectual capacity"; men with "solid Christian convictions, straight and steady judgment, with a sense of the practical and equitable; men of clear and sound principles." Herein "lies the fundamental criterion of every form of government, including democracy."²⁰

Conclusion

In conclusion, we commend to the faithful of the Province a thorough study of the solid principles and doctrines which we have here set forth. May they thereby become better citizens and models of civic virtue; and may this be their enduring contribution to the observance of this Golden Jubilee of Saskatchewan.

In the closing words of Pope Leo XIII, we, your Bishops, dare to hope that "in this way Catholics will attain two most important results: they will become helpers to the Church in preserving and propagating Christian wisdom; and they will confer the greatest benefit on civil society, the safety of which is exceedingly imperiled by evil teachings and bad passions."

²⁰ Cf. *Catholic Mind*, Feb. 1945, p. 65 seq.



Price of Impatience

Many a teacher cancels out the effect of his labors for his students by giving way continually to petulance and ill-humor. Firm discipline in parents and teachers will be remembered afterwards with respect and gratitude, but only if it is accompanied by patience. Crankiness leaves a distasteful impression that is not easily erased.—*Dermot McLoughlin, O.F.M., in the WAY OF ST. FRANCIS, July, 1956.*

The Catholic in Civic Society*

MSGR. ANGELO DELL'ACQUA
Substitute Vatican Secretary of State

YOUR EMINENCE:

IN ALMOST two simultaneous Conferences, English-speaking Canadian Catholics assembled at Vancouver and those of the French tongue meeting at Cornwall are preparing to continue, under the guidance of their Bishops, the fruitful activity of Social Life Weeks, by studying this year the problem of Citizenship.

Such a theme could not but be particularly appreciated by the Holy Father. Many times, in fact, starting with his first Encyclical Letter, he has recalled to his children, and indeed to all men of upright and sincere spirit, the conditions of a just ordering of the national and international communities. Frequently, too, he has alerted statesmen, representatives of the various professions or social orders, and even private citizens, to the seriousness of their respective responsibilities in regard to civil society. It is, then, with all his heart that His Holiness expresses sincere wishes for the success of the work of these conferences, and the wide diffusion of their influence.

Trait of the Modern Age

One of the most remarkable traits of our modern age is doubtless the rapid expansion of the attributions of the State which has unexpectedly had many new problems referred to it, and has itself extended its intervention to domains formerly exempt from its direct competency.

As a result, relations between the governing and the governed have often been modified, while the potency of modern means of communication and propaganda have meantime forged ever more closely knit links between men, and aroused citizens to greater interest in public affairs. The fact that this evolution of the modern State "encroaching and encroached upon . . . divided and overwhelmed," could provoke

*A letter to His Eminence James Cardinal McGuigan, Archbishop of Toronto, on the occasion of the opening of the Canadian Catholic Social Life Conference, October 6, 1955.

a crisis in civics, is precisely what the French Social Week analyzed last year. The directives which His Holiness himself deigned to give on that occasion will be a useful guide in your discussions (cf. Letter of July 14, 1955; A.A.S., Vol. 46, p. 482).

The two Canadian Conferences, for their part, will consider the Christian in the different spheres of public life in which he moves, and will aim especially at developing or correcting, according to the lofty and unyielding demands of Christian morals, his civic sense, that is to say, the consciousness of his rights and his duties in civic society.

These rights and duties, of course, spring in the final analysis from general or legal justice, which philosophers and theologians rightly consider the noblest of the moral virtues, since it directs all human activities towards the common good.

Importance of the Task

Consequently, the importance of this task becomes evident, for from its accomplishment not only individuals, but society itself will benefit. In fact, when the moral virtues of citizenship in individuals and private groups undergo alteration, the national community tends to disintegrate under the pressure of partisan divisions or rivalry of interest, and the normal exercise of authority is soon jeopardized. "Since they are established on this one identical foundation (of the moral order), the person, the state and the government, with their respective rights, are so united," the Holy Father has said, "that they stand or fall together." (Christmas Radio Message, 1944: A.A.S., Vol. 37, p. 15).

When explaining to their hearers those moral rules which regulate civic life, the lecturers of the Social Life Conference will remember above all that man, "so far from being the object and, as it were, a merely passive element in social life, is in fact, and must be and continue to be, its subject, its foundation and its end." (*ibid.*, p. 12)

This declaration of the Holy Father is here of capital importance. It shows why every appeal to citizenship, that is, every exhortation to support the civic order actively and consciously, is in the last analysis an appeal to respect for and service of man himself, the subject, foundation and end of social life. If the civic virtues prompt the members of the community to surpass their narrow personal views, and even to sacrifice their own immediate advantage for the benefit of the common good, it is only in order to enable civil authority to guide the community to its true ends, which are eminently respectful of man's destinies.

Proper Aim of Civics

Civics, then, far from setting the personal liberties of citizens in fallacious opposition to the exigencies of life in society, has as its proper aim to acknowledge the absolute order established by God and, consequently, to honor authority without forgetting that it is at the service of individuals, and also to favor the exercise of lawful liberties without overlooking the fact that they must be harmonized for the good of all. "Live as free men," said Saint Peter, "yet not using your freedom as a cloak for malice but as servants of God" (I Pet. 2:16).

While it is the virtue of harmony and balance between the excesses of totalitarianism and the disorders of anarchy—which equally despise man and crush him—civics is also the bond of a strong healthy society. It demands that a free current pass unceasingly between the members of the national community and its leaders. To the governing, this current brings the clear and confident expression of a mature, well-informed public opinion; to citizens, it shows forth the dispositions of an order sought out for the good of all, and understood and accepted as such. A strong feeling of the State's unity, in spite of the division of attributions and the diversity of conditions; obedience willingly accorded "not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience' sake" (Rom. 13; 5); equitable government truly at the service of the community and individuals—such are the characteristics of a civic sense based on the moral order.

Not in a single day can there be prepared for the nation loyal servants with solid convictions and sure, upright judgment. It is true, as Pope Pius XI acknowledged in his Encyclical Letter on Education, which has just marked its twenty-fifth anniversary, that "the State can exact, and take measures to secure, that all its citizens have the necessary knowledge of their civic and political duties, and a certain degree of physical, intellectual and moral culture, which, considering the conditions of our times, is really necessary for the common good." (A.A.S., Vol. 22, p. 63)

The Cradle of Civic Society

Nevertheless, if "it is proper for civil society and the State to provide what may be called civic education, not only for its youth, but for all ages and classes" (ibid. p. 64), it is clear that such a task cannot have other bases than the rules of law, of which the Church is the divinely established teacher and guardian. It is hardly necessary to recall, more-

over, the very serious and even more essential obligation which binds parents to give their children that civic education to which they are entitled (cf. Code of Canon Law, Canon 1113). This indeed is a truly integral part of the educative mission of the family, and of the Christian School which continues its action. "The family," said Pope Leo XIII, "may be regarded as the cradle of civic society, and it is in great measure within the circle of family life that the destiny of the State is fostered" (Encyclical Letter, *Sapientiae Christianae*; A.A.S. Vol. 22, p. 403).

Like their master, the disciples of Christ are not of this world, yet they live in the world (cf. John 17; 11-14). May God grant that the forthcoming Social Life Conferences may assist Canadian Catholics to meditate upon this truth of their faith. Its demands of justice and charity will spur them on to repudiate all isolationism and indifference regarding their country's affairs. But its teachings will remind them also that man does not live by bread alone, and that the temporal good of civil society must permit individuals to pursue higher ends. For all these intentions, the Sovereign Pontiff invokes a great abundance of graces and favors upon both branches of the Canadian Social Life Conference; and he cordially imparts to Your Eminence, to the organizers, lecturers and all those participating therein, His most paternal Apostolic Blessing.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Thurston N. Davis

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Vincent S. Kearney

With the collaboration of the AMERICA staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph F. MacFarlane

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Patrick H. Collins

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.

America Press Pamphlets

New!

THE CATHOLIC FAMILY

by JOHN L. THOMAS, S.J.

Father Thomas is the author of the new book *The American Catholic Family*. In a lead review of this book, Father George A. Kelly, director of the Family Life Bureau of the New York Archdiocese, writes: "This is one of the most significant pieces of sociological research to come from the pen of a Catholic scholar in recent years, not only because it deals with the family, but chiefly because it makes available for the first time empirical data drawn from the files of the separation court of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

... What makes this book rather unique is that it faces up to a problem long discussed in rectories and chancery offices but never examined with such objectivity and thoroughness . . . I warmly recommend this book . . ."

Father Thomas has called upon his experience and research to write a valuable pamphlet on the same subject for America Press. In it he discusses clearly and practically the problems Catholics face today trying to protect their marriages.

- ☐ THE CATHOLIC FAMILY
by Rev. John L. Thomas, S.J. @ 25¢
- ☐ THE LEGION OF DECENCY
by Rev. Avery Dulles, S.J. @ 15¢
- ☐ I CHOSE POLITICS
by Hon. James A. Farley @ 15¢
- ☐ WHO ARE JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES?
by Rev. Neil McCluskey, S.J. @ 15¢
- ☐ WHY A CATHOLIC COLLEGE?
by Rev. George Bull, S.J. @ 15¢
- ☐ SAINT IGNATIUS LOYOLA
by Rev. L. C. McHugh, S.J. @ 15¢
- ☐ RED CHINA TAKES OVER
by Douglas Hyde @ 25¢
- ☐ THE CHURCH OF SILENCE
by Rev. Robert A. Graham, S.J. @ 25¢
- ☐ CATHOLIC EDUCATION
by Rev. William J. McGucken, S.J. @ 25¢

(NEW DISCOUNT RATES)

1-9 Copies at List Price,
10-49 Copies at 25% Discount,
50 and Over at 33½% Discount.

Please send pamphlets checked
above in quantities specified.

I enclose _____ Bill me ☐
Orders under \$1.00 must be prepaid.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Z _____ State _____

THE AMERICA PRESS
70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.

"Measuring to a Saint"



REV. EUGENE P. MURPHY-SI
2900 WESTMINSTER PLACE
ST. LOUIS 8, MO.
43288 CX 11-56

and England during the Middle Ages it was the custom of parishioners to donate candles tall as themselves for use in Mass.

This custom gave rise to the expression of "measuring up" to a saint. People of moderate circumstances brought flowers and, later, small candles—simple offerings which gradually evolved into the present day Vigil Light.*

Today, Vigil Lights burn before countless shrines and side altars throughout the world, serving as public acts of faith—external symbols of private devotion encouraging others among the faithful to pray in their hour of need or thanksgiving.



*Vigil Light is the trade mark name identifying votive lights made exclusively by Will & Baumer.

Will & Baumer

CANDLE CO., INC.

THE PIONEER CHURCH CANDLE MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA

SYRACUSE

BOSTON
LOS ANGELES

NEW YORK
MONTREAL

CHICAGO